DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 796 SO 007 694

AUTHOR	Bronfenbrenner, Urie
TITLE	Studies in Group Upbringing. Final Report.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	74
GRANT	OEG-0-70-4534
NOTE	163p.; Appendix B, consisting of copyrighted articles, was removed; It is not included in the pagination
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$7.80 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Behavior Patterns; *Child Development; *Child Rearing; *Collective Settlements; Family Relationship; *Group Experience; Parent Role; Peer Relationship; Research Projects; Social Development; *Socialization
IDENTIFIERS	*Israel; Kibbutzim; Moshavim

ABSTRACT

Four years of an ongoing research project designed to investigate the joint impact of family, peers, teacher, and professional upbringers on the socialization of children in Israel are reported. Data are gathered on child behavior and socialization practices from fifth, sixth, and seventh graders. Settings in the two major waves of field work completed are kibbutzim, cities, and moshavim. Instruments administered provided information on the behaviors of a child's socializing agents, on his commitment socially-sanctioned behaviors, and on his development of a social and work identity as opposed to a sense of alienation. The results contradict the beliefs that kibbutz parents offer little nurturance to their children, that the peer group is the child's major source of support on the kibbutz, and that sex differences are uniformly of smaller magnitude on the kibbutz. Expected relationships borne out by the data are that kibbutz children are more independent of parents while children of Eastern origin exhibit less autonomy than those of Western background. Appendixes include a description of sample, and articles on testing for group differences, reactions to social pressure, and socialization of moral behavior in cross-cultural perspective. (Author/KSM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 093796

50

FINAL REPORT

Studies in Group Upbringing

OEG-0-70-4534

National Institute of Education Project No. 0-0371

Principal Investigator: Urie Bronfenbrenner

Cornell University

Ithaca, New York 14850

1974

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position or policy.

S0007694

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	1
Introduction	3
Why Israel?	4
Review of Related Research	7
Procedures & Research Design	10
Sample	10
Instruments & Administration	11
Method of Analysis	16
Results	18
Further Stages of Research	28
Conclusion	33
References	34
Appendices	40

A: Description of Sample

B: "Socialization practices of parents, teachers and peers in Israel: The kibbutz vs. the city"

C: "Testing for Group Differences Among Correlated Variables: An application of Multiple Regression"

D: "The Anomalous Reactions to Social Pressure of Israeli and Soviet Children Raised in Family vs. Collective Settings"

E: "The Socialization of moral behavior and judgment in cross-cultural perspective"

Studies in Group Upbringing

A Final Report for the First Four Years of Work

SUMMARY

This report describes the work accomplished in the first four years of an ongoing research project designed to investigate the joint impact of family, peers, teacher, and professional upbringers on the socialization of children in Israel. In this phase of the study, we have gathered data on both child behavior and socialization practices from fifth, sixth, and seventh-grade subjects who differ on two major ecological variables: socialization setting and ethnic background. Settings included in the two major "waves" of field work completed to date are kibbutzim, cities, and moshavim (agricultural settlements in which economic production but not child-rearing is communally shared). These settings have further been categorized by size of school, size of community, and the length of time that the settlement has been in existence. With regard to the variable of ethnic background, the major factors under consideration are whether the child's family is from a Western or Oriental (i.e., Arabic-speaking) country, and the length of time that the family has been in Israel. Instruments administered to these diverse samples have provided us with information on the behaviors of the child's socializing agents, on his commitment to socially-sanctioned behaviors, and on his development of a social and work identity as opposed to a sense of alienation.

The results of the study offer a serious challenge to certain widely accepted but thus far untested theories about child-rearing in Israel generally, and on the kibbutz in particular. Our data contradict the beliefs that kibbutz parents offer little nurturance to their children; that on the kibbutz the peer group is the child's major source of support and that he is therefore extremely susceptible to peer pressure; and that sex differences are uniformly of a smaller magnitude on the kibbutz than elsewhere in Israel. However, certain other expected relationships were borne out by the data. Kibbutz children did prove to be more independent of parents than did children in other

Israeli settings, and children of Eastern origin exhibited less autonomy from their families than did those of Western background. Similarly, Bettelheim's (1969) hypothesis that kibbutz friendships are less intimate than others was offered some support.

One important consequence of this phase of our research has been the development of plans for future study. Under a grant from the National Institutes of Health, we plan to conduct observational studies in various socialization settings in Israel, to follow up the subjects of our original research when they enter the work force, and to attempt experimental manipulation of existing ecological settings. Through this research, we hope to obtain still more concrete evidence with which we can interpret and generalize from the variety of child-rearing situations found in Israel.

Studies in Group Upbringing

A Final Report for the First Four Years of Work

INTRODUCTION

This report describes work accomplished in the first four years of an ongoing research project designed to investigate the joint impact of family, peers, teachers, and professional upbringers on the socialization of Israeli youngsters. The study has been in part modeled on earlier cross-cultural research in the Soviet Union and other nations (Bronfenbrenner & Devereux, 1961; Bronfenbrenner, 1961a, 1961b, 1967, 1969b, 1970a, 1970b; Devereux, 1962a, 1962b, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1970a, 1970b, 1972; Devereux, et al., 1962, 1969; Rodgers, et al., 1968; Rodgers, 1971; Bronfenbrenner, et al., 1965; Shouval, et al., 1974; Luscher, 1971; Garbarino & Bronfenbrenner, 1975), but has gone on to break new ground. Israel was chosen as a context for research because of the unique diversity of socialization settings and ethnic groups which it offers. We have been able to obtain data on children from kibbutzim, cities, and moshavim (collective settlements in which economic production, but not child-rearing, is communally shared); children from large and small schools and communities; children of Western and of Oriental background; children whose parents were born in Israel and those who have just arrived in the country. The information collected from these diverse samples includes data both on the behavior of various socializing agents towards the child and on the behavior of the child himself. Our experimental design thus includes four major sets of variables, two of which (socialization setting and ethnic origin) are ecological, and two of which (socialization practices and child behavior) are behavioral.

To date, the project has entailed two major stages, or "waves" of data collection and analysis, and more are planned. The first, less extensive wave involved children from a number of kibbutzim and from urban Tel-Aviv. The instruments administered

include measures of the socializing behavior of the child's parents, peers, teachers, and, on the kibbutz, the metapelet (professional upbringer). With respect to child behavior, the emphasis in the first wave was on morality, particularly on the commitment of the child to adult-sanctioned values, his ability to resist conflicting pressures from adults and peers, and his tendency to spend his time in constructive vs. anti-social activities. In the second wave, the sample was expanded to include children from many more cities, and from moshavim, as well as additional kibbutzim. The measures of socialization practices remained essentially the same, but attention in the area of child behavior shifted to the child's development of a social and work identity, as opposed to a sense of alienation. In line with this new focus, a number of instruments were added, measuring such traits as the child's locus of control, Machiavellianism, autonomy, social competence, and intimacy with others.

Although the current grant ends with the analysis of this second stage of data, the research program will continue under a grant from the National Institute of Health. In the coming years, we plan to investigate further the development of commitment and alienation in Israeli youth through observational and experimental studies as well as paper-and-pencil instruments. We hope to learn still more about the way in which socialization and ecological factors determine whether a child's abilities will be put to constructive, committed use or allowed to go to waste. We believe that this question is one of general significance both for science and for social policy.

WHY ISRAEL?

Despite a common religious and cultural heritage, Israel is a highly heterogeneous society. Concomitant with the establishment of the state was the passing of the law of return which permitted every Jewish immigrant to become a citizen of the country

as soon as he set foot on its soil. As a result, Jews from over 100 countries have settled in Israel, bringing attitudes and behaviors from many parts of the globe. Especially large immigrations have come from Russia, Poland, Germany, Italy, Bulgaria, South Africia, North and South America, Iraq, Persia, Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt and Greece. Some immigrants were religious, some anti-religious, some politically right wing, some Marxist, some educated, some illiterate -- yet all were welcomed by the government, and virtually no attempt was made to filter out individuals or groups who would not harmonize with the status quo. Thus Israeli society is a richly diverse melting pot, whose citizens have divergent ethnic backgrounds, life styles and values. At the same time, a certain amount of tension and inter-group rivalry exists, particularly between the Middle Eastern Jews coming from Arabic countries, and the Western Jews coming from European countries. Yet the different groups are bound together under a single national roof, with many vital interests and goals in common.

Though much smaller in size, Israel has some features in common with the United States. Both countries have heterogeneous populations, are technologically advanced, and exhibit the characteristics of a modern Western culture. A distinguishing characteristic of Israeli society, however, is the extent and degree of deliberately constructed social innovations designed to achieve specific objectives concerned with integrating people toward identity. It is this element, the use of social policy in the design of communities and living situations, that is a newly recognized need in the United States. To this end, the example of Israel becomes especially significant, for whereas Russia and China have attempted to do this on a grand scale, they have done so at the expense of imposed conformity. Scandinavia, on the other hand, introduced extensive social policy without compromising individualism, but did so with a homogeneous group of people. If we are looking for an example of socialization in a non-conformist society with great diversity, Israel provides an instructive case.

It is diversified in ethnicity, has considerable social mobility, and has made progress in creating a non-conformist approach to the problems of socialization. Thus Israeli experiments and experience in socialization are perhaps more relevant to the American scene than those occurring in Russia, China, or Scandinavia.

Specifically, Israel provides a unique degree of social experimentation, offering a unusual range of settings with different family-community or individual-community relationships. The kibbutzim (collective settlements) were organized as purposive communities committed to a particular ideology both in relation to themselves and to the external communities which surround them. Ideologically, economic considerations were to be dealt with communally, and all adult members, both men and women, were to work according to their abilities in the various production, service and maintenance tasks of the community. Children were to be reared communally in children's houses, with the peer group playing a central role in the socialization process from a very early age. All of these ideals have had their impact on kibbutz life, yet in recent years there has been a certain amount of erosion in the kibbutzim, and some of the founders' ideals are no longer practiced by the younger generations. Nevertheless, the kibbutzim still represent a society with a relatively closed network, in which family members interact continuously and almost exclusively with other community members, all of whom help in establishing the social identity of the children and the parents. The moshavim (cooperative farms) are less extreme along the continuum of community participation and involvement in family and individual lives. Here children live at home in the privately owned quarters of their parents; it is the agriculatural aspects of the community that are run cooperatively. Still, people on a moshav identify themselves as members of that particular moshav, and form a more close-knit group than do the residents of a typical farming village or urban neighborhood.

In studying socialization processes, we work from the assumption that both the quality of intra-familial relationships, and the quality of transactions between family

members and other persons, groups, and social systems is of central concern. In Israel, the numerous immigrant groups provide various forms of both within-family relationships, and family-social system interactions. While the European immigrants' style of family structure and parent-child relationships is primarily liberal and democratic, a significant theme in Israel is the lingering pattern among the Middle-Eastern immigrants of traditional and patriarchal family life. Here women are accorded subordinate status, and childhood is perceived as a state of imperfection to be left behind as early as possible. While this pattern is changing, many aspects of the old approach remain embedded in the culture, and have their effect on child rearing and child development. This pattern can be contrasted with the emphasis on the kibbutz, and to some extent among Western immigrants, on the development of youth groups, and on equality of the sexes. Furthermore, even within the Western group of immigrants, there are noteworthy differences. Eastern European Jews often experienced an agricultural, communal form of upbringing, where they were grouped together and separated from the rest of society. In contrast, Western European and American Jews tended to be more closely linked with their larger societies, and experienced a more cosmopolitan upbringing. Israel thus offers both a population recently gathered from an extraordinarily wide range of ethnic backgrounds, and a unique variety of socialization settings within the country. These factors combine to make it well suited to the study of ecological factors and their influence on socialization.

RELATED RESEARCH

Although there have been a number of published studies on the processes and effects of kibbutz upbringing, virtually none duplicates the kind of data we are in the process of analyzing, or the additional material we intend to gather. Few, if any, studies have attempted <u>systematically</u> to take advantage of the variations in

socialization settings and practices to be found within Israeli society in order to illuminate important theoretical and practical issues with respect to the socialization process and its effects. Moreover, no research to date has explored the role of social institutions and social processes in the development by the child of a sense of commitment as against alienation.

The work of Rabin (1957a, 1957b, 1958a, 1958b, 1958c, 1959, 1961, 1965) is probably the closest approximation to the kind of comparative studies we have engaged in over the past four years. His objective was to compare personality characteristics of samples of kibbutz children matched with non-kibbutz controls. No attempt was made, however, to take advantage of the systematic variations to be found both across and within the several kibbutz movements, nor was any comparison made with moshavim. Although Rabin's subjects came from a number of different kibbutzim, essentially he treated them as a single homogeneous sample. Finally, his measurements of child characteristics were confined to individual clinical assessments and tests without any attempt to gauge the impact of different socialization agents such as parents, metapelet, and the peer group. A new study by Long, Platt and Henderson (1973) was the first to compare kibbutz children with two groups of moshav children (those of Oriental background and those of European background) on a series of self-social symbols tasks. But in this study, the samples were small, and the variations among kibbutzim and moshavim ignored.

The work on kibbutz socialization which is probably most widely known in America, is the series of studies by Spiro (1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1960). This research, however, has the shortcoming of being based almost entirely on field work in a single kibbutz in the Hashomear Hatsair movement. A similar limitation applies to a number of systematic studies carried out by Faigin (1958), Gewirtz and Gewirtz (1968), Irvine (1952, 1966), Kugelmass and Breznitz (1967), Rettig (1966), Rettig and Pasamanick (1963), Parsons (1959), Shapira and Madsen (1969), Wolins (1969a, 1969b), and Maccoby and

Feldman (1972) in which the number of different kibbutzim used in the sample are either very few of undifferentiated in the analysis. A collection of papers by Neubauer (1965) is highly speculative in character. As documented in a review by Bronfenbrenner (1969a), the same characterization applies in even greater force to Bettelheim's (1969) recent study of kibbutz education.

The only work which approaches the kibbutz in terms of a comparative structural and social-psychological perspective of the type utilized in the present project is that of the late Talmon-Garber (1952, 1954, 1956, 1959, 1963, 1964, 1965), who was concerned primarily with the functioning of the family within the kibbutz and related problems of mate selection and sex role differentiation. Talmon-Garber did not carry out any studies, however, focusing directly on the comparison of processes and effects of socialization in different types of social settings. Finally, to our knowledge, in none of the investigations carried out to date has an attempt been made to measure dependent variables by means of carrying out the same experiments in different socialization settings in Israel.

Although none of the previous work has involved a systematic, comparative experimental design of the scope of the present project, the earlier studies are highly suggestive with respect to the kinds of dependent variables that, for theoretical or empirical reasons, are believed to be affected by differing degrees of group versus family upbringing. For this reason, both the kibbutz studies cited above, and the many theoretical papers written about different aspects of Israeli society (Gerson, 1970; Kleinberger, 1969; Shuval, 1963; Tsur, 1972; Eisenstadt, 1967) have been and will continue to be employed in deciding the specific issues to be explored in our research.

PROCEDURES AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Sample

To date, the project has involved the use of two separate samples, one in each wave of our data collection. The sample for Wave I included boys and girls living on 32 kibbutzim, and those attending three schools in Tel-Aviv (for a total of 9 city classrooms). Most of the children were sixth-graders (generally 11 or 12 years of age), although some fifth-graders were included in the kibbutz sample. To provide an approximate match with the background of kibbutz parents, the schools were chosen from predominantly middle-class neighborhoods in which most residents were from families of European origin. The kibbutzim were classified according to a number of factors which might be expected to have consequences for the socialization of children; these included the kibbutz movement or federation (Artzi, Meuchad, or Ichud, with Artzi being the most socialist or left-wing politically, and Ichud the farthest right), size (fewer than 100 adult members, 100-300 members, or more than 300 members), and generation (second or third generation settlement, depending on when the kibbutz was founded). We had hoped to obtain at least two kibbutzim in each cell of the resulting 3 x 3 x 2 matrix, but some cells could not be filled because certain combinations proved rare or nonexistent. The kibbutzim were further categorized by sleeping arrangements -- in two, children slept at home with their parents, while in the remaining 30, they slept in the children's houses. In all, this wave included 316 city children and 388 kibbutz children, for a total sample of 704.

The Wave II sample was both larger in overall size (total N = 1,957) and more wide-ranging in terms of socialization settings involved. Data were obtained from 23 kibbutzim (483 children), one school in each of twelve cities in various locations in Israel (1212 children), and 14 moshavim (262 children). Pupils from the fifth, sixth, and seventh grades were included, although not every grade was represented in

each kibbutz or moshav. As before, both kibbutzim and moshavim were classified according to size (fewer than 160 adult members, 160-200 members, or more than 200 members), and generation (second or third). As in Wave I, kibbutzim were further classified by the ideological movement to which they belonged, and by sleeping arrangements (in four of the 23 kibbutzim, children slept at home rather than in children's houses). With regard to the urban sample, both the schools themselves and the cities in which they are located were categorized as large or small, (city population greater or less than 30,000, and whether there were more than two classrooms per grade in the school).

A final characteristic of the sample which is of importance to our study is the ethnic background of the respondents. It was found that almost all members of kibbutzim and moshavim were of Western origin (that is, from European or other non-Arabic countries). Our city sample, while also predominantly Western, was nevertheless more varied, with 287 of 1212 children having both parents of Eastern descent (from Arabic-speaking countries), and with another 136 being of Eastern background on one or the other side of the family.

Tables providing more detailed statistical information on the individual schools and communities which comprise both Wave I and Wave II samples can be found in Appendix A.

Instruments and Administration

In both waves, the data of the study derive from the responses of the children to a series of questionaires. All the children in each classroom or kibbutz were tested together as a group. Instructions and test items were read orally by trained administrators from our Tel-Aviv research staff, in the absence of other adults. Although there is substantial overlap of instruments used in the two stages of the study, especially in the area of socialization practices, there are also a number of measures which were administered only in one or the other wave. Waves I and II are

therefore dealt with separately below.

Wave I

Most of the techniques administered in Wave I had previously been used for research in other countries. For the purposes of this study, the instruments were divided into two packets, one administered to all children in the study (i.e., to both kibbutz and city children), and the other only to the city classrooms, for the purpose of comparison with other cultures in which the same procedures had been carried out previously. The instruments employed with children in Wave I were the following:

Dilemmas Experiment. This experiment, now carried out in over 15 countries (see Shouval, et al. 1974; Garbarino & Bronfenbrenner, 1975, copies of which appear in Appendices D and E) measures the influence of peer and adult pressure on the reported readiness of children to engage in morally disapproved behavior such as denying responsibility for property damage or cheating on a test. Experimental pressure is created by telling the children, after an initial base condition, that their responses to the next set of questions will be shown either to their parents and teacher, or to their classmates. In addition to being used with the Wave I sample, this instrument was also administered in both Russian and Hebrew to children who had recently arrived in Israel from the Soviet Union. The results of this experiment are reported below.

Temptation, Resistance, and Guilt. This instrument, administered directly after the Dilemmas Experiment, asks the child to indicate how often someone in his group suggests engaging in the kinds of misconduct described in the Dilemmas questionnaire, how he behaves in such situations (i.e., whether he proposes the misbehavior, goes along with it, or resists), and to what extent he feels concerned about his behavior afterwards.

Cornell Parent Behavior Inventory. This instrument requires the child to indicate the extent to which his parents engage in 14 different kinds of socialization behaviors, each of which is represented by 2 or 3 separate items. Parent variables

assessed include nurturance, achievement demands, encouragement of independent thinking, physical punishment, rejection, encouragement of autonomy, and strictness, as well as other traits.

Socialization Inventory. This instrument was derived from the Parent Behavior Inventory, above. It includes 12 items, each of which represents one aspect of socialization behavior, and most of which fall into two clusters labelled "Nurturance" and "Discipline." The questions were asked not only with respect to parents, but also with reference to peers, teachers, and, on the kibbutz, the metapelet. The instrument thus permits a comparison of the extent to which various types of socialization are carried out by different agents.

Inventory of Time Spent. The children were asked to report how much time they spend on weekdays, weekends, and holidays with each of the following: mother, father, siblings, a single friend, a group of friends, teacher, and, in the case of the kibbutz, the metapelet.

"Who Does What". The child is asked how often his mother, father, and (on the kibbutz) the metapelet engage in a range of behaviors such as saying goodnight, taking care of him when he's sick, taking walks with him, or playing with him.

Demographic questionnaire. This instrument provides information on the place of birth and age of the child and his parents, the size of his family, the amount of education his parents have had, and whether his family is intact.

The instruments administered only to city children in Wave I were the following:

Family Authority Structure Inventory. The child is asked to what extent one parent has greater power than the other in decisions about a variety of matters affecting the child or the family as a whole. It yields a two-dimensional typology, one dimension dealing with the degree to which parental roles in decision-making are differentiated or undifferentiated; the other with the degree to which relatively more or less weight in decision-making is attributed to the father or to the mother.

"What Adults Are Like". This instrument is designed to measure the child's perceptions of adults. He is asked to comment on how many of the adults he knows are fun to be with, strict, boring, cheerful, truthful, and unfair, among other characteristics.

Perferred Association Inventory. Children are asked how they would feel about spending a free afternoon alone, with a best friend, with mother, with father, or with a group of friends.

"Things We Do". Through this instrument the child provides a self-report of the extent to which he engages in activities of three general types: 1) constructive activities such as participating in sports, working on a hobby, helping someone, etc.; 2) passive recreation such as listening to records, going to a party or a show, watching sports events, etc.; and 3) anti-social behavior, involving activities directed against peers, adults, or the physical environment.

Wave II

With respect to the major variable of socializing behavior, the Wave II instruments are essentially the same as those used in Wave I. Thus the Short Form Socialization Questionnaire, Inventory of Time Spent, Family Authority Structure, and the demographic questionnaire, were administered to all children in Wave II. Only one instrument related to socialization experiences was added, a questionnaire measuring the amount of contact the child has with people outside of his community. With respect to child behavior, however, our growing interest in alienation vs. commitment dictated the addition of a number of new instruments. Because of the large amount of time required to administer all of these measures, they were divided into three packets, with moshav and kibbutz classrooms each receiving only two of these "blocks" (the missing block being systematically rotated from one community to another), and city children receiving all three. The instruments contained in the blocks were as follows:

Block A

Social Competence. This is a new measure constructed by our colleague Iris Levin of Tel-Aviv University: its purpose is to assess whether a child has enough self-confidence to try to get others to do what he wants in various social or interpersonal situations. An internal analysis of the instrument indicates that it is highly reliable in all samples tested, regardless of sex, setting (kibbutz, city, or moshav), or ethnicity (Eastern or Western family background.)

Machiavellianism. This is an adaptation by Nachamie (1969) for children of an instrument originally developed by Christie (Christie and Geis, 1970) to measure the extent to which a person perceives himself and others as objects of manipulation and exploitation.

Interpersonal Attitudes. This instrument builds upon the "What Adults are Like" measure used in Wave I to measure the child's perception of both adults and peers. Four *a priori* sub-scales have been confirmed through internal validation: trustworthiness, fairness, sincerity, and altruism. The measure is highly reliable, especially for positive evaluations, and behaves similarly regardless of sex, setting, or ethnicity.

Block B

Locus of Control Scale. This is a well-established technique for assessing the child's feeling of power versus helplessness in relation to his environment.

Activities Questionnaire. This is a revised and briefer version of the "Things We Do" instrument administered in Wave I.

Autonomy Scale. This instrument, developed and standardized by Professor Ron Shouval of the University of Tel-Aviv (1971), provides a measure of the extent to which the child feels himself capable of acting

alone as opposed to having to rely on someone else. The technique yields four independent factor scores, two focusing on autonomy from specific socializing agents (parents and peers) and two on autonomy in specific situations (traumatic and task-completion.)

Block C

Sociometric Questionnaire. Whereas the preceding instruments assess the child's own perception of himself and others, the sociometric questionnaire measures aspects of alienation vs. relatedness of a particular child as they are perceived by other children. For purposes of comparison, the child is also asked to rate himself. Among the variables assessed are the following: altruism, egocentrism, social apathy, hostility, usefulness to others, dependability, cooperativeness, intellectual competence, and leadership. The internal analysis of this instrument is not yet complete, but preliminary results indicate high reliability and homogeneity across sex, setting, and ethnic background.

Method of Analysis

Although the analysis of our data has required a variety of statistical techniques, the design of the study has dictated the frequent recurrence of one basic statistical model, wherein two or more groups which differ in ecological setting (e.g., city children vs. kibbutz children, children of Eastern vs. Western background) are compared with respect to the socialization practices of various agents (mother, father, teachers, peers), the corresponding behaviors of the child, and the relationship between these two sets of variables, where necessary controlling for possibly confounding factors. Since no existing statistical design or computer program was available to handle so complex an analysis necessarily involving unequal numbers, we had to develop our own. The model, and the procedures involved are best described in the context of a concrete

example. For this purpose, we have chosen our analysis of the socialization practices of parents, teachers, and peers in city and kibbutz settings, based on the data derived from the Wave I Short Form Socialization Questionnaire (Devereux, et al., 1974).

Preliminary analyses of this instrument revealed that the mean of the responses of the children in our samples to the various items differed significantly from kibbutz to kibbutz, and also from classroom to classroom in the city sample. Because of the existence of these "classroom effects" in both samples, a decision was made to treat classrooms and kibbutzim, rather than individual children, as the units of analysis, taking classroom means on our various items as the basic measured variables. City-kibbutz differences were then tested for statistical significance against the variance among groups within the city and kibbutz samples. This analytical procedure has the effect of requiring that, to arrive at any generalization about differences between the behavior of socialization agents in the kibbutz and the city, we must be able to demonstrate that such differences clearly override the within-sample variation among the kibbutzim and among the classrooms in our two sampled populations.

Although the 12 items included in the questionnaire employed in the analysis were intended to represent analytically and empirically distinguishable aspects of behavior, in fact an extensive pattern of low but significant intercorrelations exists among them. Such intercorrelations may reflect empirical realities of the world we are examining: for example, parents who punish in one way may in fact be more inclined to punish in other ways as well. But such correlations may also contain an element of artifact: for example, children may differ in a general tendency to give socially acceptable responses, or to see some agents in more favorable terms than others. In the pressence of such "halo" responses, individual items would not be meaningful discriminated.

Because of the existence of such intercorrelations, the item-by-item significance

tests are not all statistically independent of each other, and may in fact tend to exaggerate the number of apparent differences between the two samples. In order to control for these correlated findings and to obtain a clearer picture regarding which items or clusters of items were independently discriminating between the two samples, we employed a specially adapted technique of multiple regression analysis which permits assessing the extent to which difference across settings in one variable still obtains after control for other variables. The details of this method have been fully described in a separate technical paper, a copy of which appears in Appendix B (Bronfenbrenner 1973).

While the results of the multiple regression analysis are then presented in the familiar form of means, mean differences, and corresponding significance levels, they differ from those obtained by conventional analyses of variance in having been subjected to a double test. They are significant not only as they stand, but after control for all other mean differences reported in the same analysis; in other words, the findings are statistically independent of each other.

This basic statistical design is being used whenever two or more groups are compared. The method has recently been improved employing a more general model which takes into account individual as well as group (e.g., classroom) scores, and the corresponding computer program is now being written up to permit use by others.

RESULTS

At the time of this writing, our work on the more extensive, second wave of data collection has only completed the stage of internal validation of our instruments. Substantive analyses of this wave are now under way, but we are not yet at the point where we can report results. Analyses of our first wave of field work, however, have progressed much farther, with the following results:

1) Socialization practices in Israeli city and kibbutz. In the first wave, the socialization inventory was administered to a sample of 600 Israeli pre-

adolescents, half from 29 kibbutzim (stratified by movement, size, and age of kibbutz), and half from nine school classrooms in the city of Tel-Aviv. Using the same set of scales for each agent, the children provided descriptions of the socializing behavior of mother, father, peers, teacher, and, in the case of the kibbutz, metapelet. This study has just been published in the June 1974 issue of Child Development (Devereux, Shouval, Bronfenbrenner, Rodgers, Kav-Venaki, Kiely, and Karson, 1974). A copy of the article appears in Appendix B. The principal differences in socialization experiences across setting were the following:

a) Kibbutz and city parents were seen as equally nurturant and supportive, but city parents were much more salient as disciplinarians.

b) In the kibbutz, the role of the teacher, as perceived by the children, closely resembled that of the city parent, in combining high support with moderate discipline. In the city, the roles were much more differentiated, with the teacher receding in importance in virtually every respect.

c) Contrary to expectations, in the kibbutz neither the metapelet nor the peer group emerged as strong sources of support, but both were salient as agents of discipline and disapproval.

With due regard to the limitations of verbal report as a source of behavioral data, the results are interpreted as contradicting the view that kibbutz parents are less nurturant and supportive than their counterparts in conventional families. In particular, the results challenge the claim, put forth primarily by psychoanalytically-oriented observers (Bettelheim, 1969; Neubauer, 1965), that kibbutz upbringing involves risks and maladjustments associated with parental separation and institutionalized child rearing. Rather, the results indicate that parents in the kibbutz are at least as warm as and less punitive than their counterparts in the city, a pattern which suggests

less ambivalence in the parent-child relationship in the communal setting. Even more characteristic of kibbutz upbringing, however, is the diffusion of parental responsibility to other members of the community. In particular, in contrast to the published literature which focuses on the importance of the metapelet of caregiver as a primary agent of socialization for the child, the results call attention to the powerful role of the kibbutz teacher once the child enters school.

Some implications of these different socialization patterns for the psychological development of the child are suggested in the report and will be investigated in subsequent analyses. Drawing upon available data on child characteristics and behavior, we plan to examine these outcomes as a function of the separate and combined influences of different socializing agents.

2) The anomalous reactions to social pressure of Israeli and Soviet children. The fact that collective upbringing in the kibbutz has its ideological origins in Marxist ideology and practice raises the question of whether such upbringing would result in the high levels of conformity to social pressure reported in our early experiments with school children in the U.S.S.R. (Bronfenbrenner, 1967, 1970a, 1970b). For example, Bettelheim has argued that the product of kibbutz upbringing is a personality highly dependent on group approval and support. In discussion with leading kibbutz educators, however, we were told that kibbutz ideology and practice, while emphasizing the importance of the collective, do not subordinate the individual to the group as is the rule in Soviet society.

To test this hypothesis, Shouval, Kav-Venaki, Bronfenbrenner, and Kiely (1974) replicated the Soviet experiment with groups of Israeli children of the same age (twelve years old) both from kibbutzim and conventional family settings. (A copy of this paper, now being submitted for publication, appears

in Appendix D.) Contrary to expectations based on Bettelheim's analysis, kibbutz children conformed far less to social pressure, whether from peers or adults, than did their Soviet counterparts. Nor did they differ appreciably in their reaction from Israeli children raised in conventional family settings. In both of these groups, the pattern of response was similar to that observed among twelve-year-olds in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe, who, in turn, are far less conforming to adult-approved values than children from Japan or Eastern Europe (Bronfenbrenner, 1967; Luscher, 1971; Garbarino and Bronfenbrenner, 1975). We believe that the Israeli kibbutz is in fact a less pure example of collective upbringing than is the Soviet boarding school, and that it is therefore not surprising that we found the impact of family vs. collective upbringing on children's reactions to social pressure to be greater in the Soviet than in the Israeli sample.

The only reliable difference between kibbutz children and their city counterparts occurred in willingness to inform an adult of misconduct by one's friends. Kibbutz youngsters were more willing to provide such information than their urban agemates, but the level of such informing was substantially lower than that found in the U.S.S.R. and other East European countries and similar to that observed in the United States, Switzerland, Holland, and Scandinavia.

Both Israeli samples, however, exhibited two features which distinguished them from their agemates in most other countries. First, contrary to the typical finding, family-reared Israeli girls were not more adult-oriented than Israeli boys, a result which suggests that Israeli parents place more emphasis on the socialization of boys and less on that of girls than do families in other cultures.

The second anomalous finding was observed in the pattern of response to social pressure under different experimental conditions. Whereas, in over a dozen countries in which the experiment has been conducted, the greatest conformity to socially-approved conduct occurred in the so-called "adult condition," in which the child is informed that his responses will become known to his parents, Israeli children gave more socially-approved responses under the base condition, in which answers become known only to the investigator. Russian children, in contrast, gave less adult-oriented (or socially-approved) responses in the base conditions than they did under either the adult- or peer-pressure treatments. Thus, Israeli children showed the most conformity to adult-approved norms when told that no one would be aware of their responses, while Russian children displayed the least adult-orientation in this base condition. At the same time, in both countries, the effect of social pressure was the same whether threatened from adults or from classmates. It is this finding, the almost total lack of differentiation between the adult- and peer-pressure conditions, that sets off Israel and Russia most strikingly from the other cultural settings in which the experiment has been done.

This unusual pattern is interpreted as reflecting the presence in both the Soviet Union and Israel of a superordinate national goal which overrides the "generation gap" commonly found in other cultures. In Russia, this national concern is communism; in Israel, the issue is simply one of national survival. In both cases, the result is that children's reaction when told that others will learn of their answers to the experimental dilemmas is the same whether those others are adults or peers. The fact that in Russia, social pressure from either source gives rise to more adult-oriented responses is interpreted as reflecting the constant insistence in the Soviet Union on

conformity to the communist ideology, and the use of the peer group by adults to accomplish this end. Conversely, in Israel, where moral autonomy and independence in children are widely emphasized as highly desirable, and even as necessary for the survival of the nation, children instead gave responses indicating less conformity to generally approved norms when told that others would see their answers. Thus both societies emerge as successfully inculcating in their children the distinctive qualities that each highly prizes.

3) The role of language in response to social pressure. The recent immigration to Israel of many Soviet Jews, and with them their children who had attended Russian schools, presented a unique opportunity for investigating a hypothesis about the role of language in reaction to social pressure. Our previous studies in the U.S.S.R. had revealed that Soviet children showed the highest level of conformity of any of the 12 national groups with whom the dilemmas experiment has been conducted to date (Garbarino and Bronfenbrenner, 1975, a copy of which appears in Appendix E). The question arises whether or not the Soviet-educated children from Jewish emigré families would exhibit a similar level of responses. But even more intriguing is the possibility that these children might react differently to the hypothetical dilemmas as a function of whether the instructions for the experiment were presented in Russian or in Hebrew (which these youngsters had already learned). Our initial hypothesis was that the pattern of response would be more like that of Soviet children when the instructions were given in Russian and closer to that of Israeli youngsters under Hebrew instructions.

The experiment was carried out by Kav Venaki, Karson, Bernstein, and Eyal (1974) with a sample of 42 Russian emigré children. Two features of the results are especially noteworthy:

a) In terms of overall readiness to conform to adult-approved standards, the pattern of response for the emigré sample was much more similar to that of native-born Israeli children than to that of Soviet youngsters. It is of course impossible to say whether the less conformist orientation of the emigré children pre-existed or followed their arrival in Israel.

b) The language of instruction significantly affected the pattern of response, but in a direction precisely opposite to that of our original hypothesis. Specifically, shift in response between adult and peer conditions was significantly greater when the language of administration was Hebrew than when it was Russian, and the most socially approved responses were obtained when pressure from adults was threatened in Hebrew. When the instructions were given in Russian, there was relatively little difference between responses under the adult and peer condition.

The most plausible explanation of this pattern of results appears to us to be the following. Children are most likely to give socially approved responses when they feel themselves to be under the eyes of authority. For Russian born children who have recently immigrated to Israel, the language of authority is Hebrew, especially when spoken by adult members of the Israeli society. In contrast, Russian has become the language of the informal primary group who share a history of common experiences. In this context, it matters less whether those who know about one's conduct are adults rather than peers, whereas in Hebrew the distinction is one between formal authority and the more informal group of agemates.

4) Intimacy of friendship among kibbutz and city youngsters. In a doctoral dissertation just completed by an Israeli student who came to Cornell to study and join the project staff, Sharabany (1974) found substantial support for the hypothesis proposed by Bettelheim (1969) that kibbutz children form

friendships which are not as intimate as those established by agemates raised in conventional families. The interpretation of the substantial differences found is complicated by the fact that degree of intimacy was evaluated solely from the verbal response of the child, thus allowing for the possibility that the data might reflect relative willingness to express intensity of the relationship between two friends as distinguished from the actual character of that relation. Further investigation of this problem is planned in the second stage of the proposed research, which involves observation of actual behavior in selected settings and groups.

5) Family authority structure and willingness to inform on peers. In an analysis of data from the social pressure experiment, Rodgers (1972) found that Israeli children were less willing to inform on peers, when pressed to do so by adults, than were children in any of the twelve nations previously sampled. If informing on peers means yielding to adult authority, Israeli children appear well set to resist. But there are indications of less authoritarianism in Israeli families than in most of the other nations studied. For example, on a measure of family authority structure, the children in our Tel-Aviv sample saw less authority differentiation between their fathers and mothers than did children in our urban German sample, where families still tended towards father dominance. Rodgers also found that in Israel, kibbutz children were significantly more disposed to inform on peers than were children in the Tel Aviv sample, a finding which replicates the rural-urban difference reported in all other samples studied to date (Japan, Hungary, Canada and West Germany). Various hypotheses about these intriguing patterns of difference in readiness to inform on peers have been explored in a working paper by a graduate student working on the project (Tietjen, 1973).

6) Differences in autonomy among Oriental, Western and kibbutz children. In

an honors thesis, Karson (1973) studied the disposition towards autonomy as a function of socialization setting and ethnic origin. Three samples of Israeli children were compared: those of Western ethnic origin in the left-wing or socialist kibbutzim, city children of Western ethnic origin, and city children of Eastern ethnic origin (whose parents immigrated from Arabic-speaking countries). The samples were matched on father's occupational level and school grade level (5th and 6th grades). Differences were examined in three factorially distinct forms of autonomy as measured by a multiple choice instrument developed by Shouval (1971): autonomy from parents, autonomy from peers, and autonomous striving in response to obstacles to instrumental activity. Karson found Eastern children to be more conforming to their parents' pressures than the two Western groups, a finding in line with the literature which describes the Eastern family as being traditionally authoritarian and extremely close-knit. In relation to peers, kibbutz children, especially girls, were less autonomous than Western city children, and Eastern children more independent of the group than the two Western samples. In the face of obstacles, a similar pattern appeared, with kibbutz children less likely to opt for autonomous solutions, perhaps reflecting greater availability of resources for instrumental tasks and less need for self-reliance in the kibbutz. Surprisingly, with respect to autonomy from parents and peers, sex differences were larger among kibbutz reared children than in the two city samples. In the kibbutz, where sexual equality is presumably stressed, girls emerged as more conforming to both parent and peer pressures than their male counterparts. In contrast, among Easterners, where woman's role is subordinate to that of men, significant sex differences did not emerge. Perhaps these results suggest that kibbutz girls, who expect sexual equality, in fact see themselves as unimportant, and their futures as largely limited to

either teaching, or kitchen and laundry work, while Eastern girls, rooted in a history of inequality, may find that the new options available in Israeli society provide them with feelings of increased freedom and importance.

7) A comparison of autonomy in kibbutz and moshav children. Findings consistent with the above are emerging from results currently being analyzed from a study directed by Shouval comparing levels of autonomy in a large sample of kibbutz and moshav children. Given the stronger role taken by parents in the moshavim, and the salience of the peer group as a socializaing agent in the kibbutz, the results of this study are in line with theoretical expectations. Kibbutz children gave responses revealing greater independence from their parents' wishes than did children raised in the moshav. In contrast it was moshav youngsters who were less conforming to the influence of their peers. Finally, moshav children showed greater independence in the face of obstacles than their agemates in the kibbutz, a finding which again may reflect the absence in the moshav of readily available assistance and instruction from peers and adults routinely present in the "kvutza" -- the collective educational setting distinctive in kibbutz upbringing.

8) Difference among kibbutzim and kibbutz movements. Of importance for both substantive and methodological reasons is the question of whether kibbutzim differ from each other, both within and across political movements, in their ideology and practices of child rearing. Preliminary analyses indicate an affirmative answer on both counts. On almost all the children's reports of the behavior of their parents, teachers, peers, and metaplot, there were significant differences among kibbutzim. The same was true in experimental results of response to social pressure. In addition, there were differences among the three kibbutz movements in the frequency of threatening physical punishment by all agents (least in Artzi, the most socialist movement,

greatest in Ichud, the "right-wing" movement). A similar trend was apparent in the data on sleeping in the parents' home (from a few times a year in Artzi to two or three times a month in Ichud). Children in the "right-wing" movement also reported a larger number of friends than did the children in the other two movements. In general these trends support the conclusion that socialization practices in the right-wing movement are intermediate between those of the kibbutz ideal and those of non-collectivist settings typical of the city.

FURTHER STAGES OF RESEARCH

During this past year, we have devoted substantial effort to the development of plans for future research, based on the results of the current phase of our study. These plans are summarized below:

I. Observations in Selected Ecological and Experimental Settings

As a means for further validating and clarifying the results and analyses of the extensive data based on verbal reports, we propose to undertake more intensive, systematic observational studies. These would be carried out with selected groups, in both naturalistic and experimental settings, for the purpose of testing specific hypotheses developed in the course of the preceding large-scale analysis. At this juncture, it is of course difficult to anticipate which groups or situations will be selected for these studies, but possibilities include the following:

A. Cross-validation of verbal reports of parent-child interaction through direct observation at home for small samples of kibbutz, moshav, and city families.

B. Cross-validation of self-report and sociometric measures of child behavior through direct observation of children in selected classroom and play settings in kibbutz, moshav, and city.

C. Cross-validation of antecedent-consequent relationships based on verbal reports by analagous correlational analyses of observational data obtained in steps A and B above.

D. The observation of parent-child, teacher-child, and peer interaction in critically contrasting ecological settings; for example, in kibbutzim in which the children sleep at home versus those in which they live in the children's house. Additional contrasts would be indicated by the results of analyses in Stage I.

E. The development of standard situations deliberately designed to evoke responses reflective of alienation vs. commitment. For example, children might be asked to help a younger child having difficulty with schoolwork, do an errand for a neighbor, or volunteer in a community project. To assess commitment to a task, they might be interrupted in an activity, or given an inconspicuous chance to quit, leaving others to finish the job.

F. A major objective of observational studies is the development of behavioral measures of alienation vs. commitment. While it is difficult to be precise about the nature of these measures in advance, we anticipate that they will involve both naturalistic and experimental assessments of helping assignments, involvement in productive activities, and expressions of solidarity. At the opposite, alienated end of the continuum, we would expect not only low levels of the foregoing behaviors, but also avoidance of, or resistance to, activities and relationships, such as refusing requests for help or invitations to participate, deprecation of one's own and other's efforts, expressions of hopelessness and futility, lack of trust in others, and disinterest or distaste for their company.

We see the development of these observational measures as a substantial undertaking requiring a series of pilot studies, training of observers, and construct validation of the measures. About a year will probably be devoted to this developmental stage.

Whereas work in observational measures of dependent variables will have to begin essentially from scratch, some progress has already been made in the development of methods for assessing socializing behaviors and the responses they evoke. A feasible and reliable observation method for this purpose has been developed by Bronfenbrenner (cf. Garbarino, 1973), and employed with a variety of age groups and settings ranging from college classrooms (Garbarino and Bronfenbrenner, 1973) to experiments involving interaction between kindergarteners and twelve-year-olds (Garbarino, 1973).

II. Follow-up Studies in Work Settings

The twelve-year-old children studied in the first phase of our research project will be entering the work force and the army during the next few years. Thus, one of the plans we have developed for the next stage of our research is designed specifically to take advantage of this opportunity to add a longitudinal aspect to our study. We propose to collect, over a two or three year period, data on the actual work experiences and social adjustment of our subjects, who, at 17 and 18 years of age, will for the most part have completed their studies and will be engaged full-time in productive work.

These data will be gathered in two ways. First, the employers, supervisors, and co-workers of subjects in all settings will be asked to make systematic evaluations of work performance and adjustment in comparison to previous workers and present peers. In addition, on the kibbutzim and moshavim, where youngsters are assigned to agricultural or factory work within the community, we shall also be able to carry out observational studies in the actual work setting. The situation has the added advantage that youngsters in these settings, unlike their city counterparts, tend to be concentrated within a relatively limited number of similar occupations and work settings, thus allowing for stricter comparison.

The data on work performance and adjustment will then be related to indices of

alienation and commitment obtained at age twelve, and to data previously collected on socialization experiences. The first analysis will examine whether alienation in preadolescence does in fact relate to later work adjustment; the second will focus on the effect of childhood socialization and education on subsequent performance on the job. The specific analyses to be carried out will be analogous to those conducted previously, with measures of actual work adjustment now substituted for earlier self-report and experimental indices of alienation and commitment. In addition, repeated observation of our original measures of alienation will enable us to learn about the continuity of such variables over time. In summary, the follow-up studies will permit us to assess the impact of early socialization contexts and processes on the development of alienation vs. commitment and its relation to work adjustment in early adulthood.

III. Experimental Innovations in Selected Ecological Settings

The final phase of the research will involve experiments in which critical features of existing socialization settings are modified, or new features introduced, in order to investigate and test particular hypotheses about the social, structural and behavioral antecedents of alienation vs. commitment as an aspect of human development. Following theoretical models and research designs currently being developed in a program on experimental human ecology described by Bronfenbrenner under a grant from the Foundation for Child Development (Bronfenbrenner, 1974), we plan to introduce, in the several socialization settings under study, experimental variations designed to test hypotheses emerging from the two previous stages of the research. Again it is difficult to state in advance what these hypotheses and variations might be; here, however, are two possible example:

A. Using randomly selected experimental and control subjects, we might introduce a kibbutz-type experience for moshav children by arranging for them to visit their parents at work on a regular basis. Observations would be made in the home to check

for changes in patterns of parent-child interaction both in terms of a before-after design and comparison with a control group.

b. Should observational studies confirm the restricted disciplinary role played by the metapelet with older children, we might suggest to the kibbutz leadership the possibility of a special training program that would aid the upbringer in developing a more diversified and constructive pattern of interactions with the children under her care.

There is a second reason why such innovations cannot be specified in advance: they cannot originate solely from the research team but must be developed in cooperation with the persons living and working in the given setting. For this reason, our professional and lay collaborators have been, and will continue to be, involved in developing innovations to be introduced in the lives of these children and families. In this regard we are fortunate that over the past three years our relations with the groups with which we have been working have grown in mutual respect and trust.

CONCLUSION

The work described in this report represents the first stage of a continuing program of research. As yet, our analyses have not advanced far enough to permit us to come to definitive conclusions about the overall relationships of ecological factors, socialization experiences, and child behavior in Israel. However, our work has progressed sufficiently to confirm certain impressions about childrearing in Israel generally and on the kibbutz in particular, and to challenge other widely accepted views. On the one hand, our data indicate, as expected, that kibbutz children are less dependent on their parents than are children in other Israeli settings, and that children of Eastern origin are less autonomous from their families than are those of Western background. Similarly, Bettelheim's (1969) hypothesis that kibbutz friendships are less intimate than others was offered some support. On the other hand, our results contradict the views that kibbutz parents are less nurturant than parents in conventional families; that on the kibbutz the child's major source of support and discipline is the peer group, and that he is therefore highly susceptible to peer pressure; or that sex differences are uniformly of a smaller magnitude on the kibbutz than in conventional families. Evidence of this kind, while confirming the general thesis that variation in social structure significantly influences the socialization process and its effects, at the same time requires a reexamination of theories of socialization based primarily on a priori considerations. We are currently in the process of examining the implications of our findings for general theories of socialization and development.

REFERENCES

Bettelheim, B. The Children of the Dream. New York: Macmillan, 1969.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Some familial antecedents of responsibility and leadership in adolescence. In L. Petrillo and B.L. Bass (Eds.), Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961. pp. 239-272. (a)

Bronfenbrenner, U. Toward a theoretical model for the analysis of parent-child relationships in a social context. In J.D. Glidewell (Ed.), Parent Attitudes and Child Behavior. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1961, pp. 90-109. (b)

Bronfenbrenner, U. Response to pressure from peers versus adults among Soviet and American school children. International Journal of Psychology, 1967, 2, 199-207.

Bronfenbrenner, U. "The Dream of the Kibbutz." Saturday Review, September 20, 1969. (a)

Bronfenbrenner, U. Two Worlds of Childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970. (a)

Bronfenbrenner, U. On the making of new men: Some extrapolations from research. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1969, 1, 4-24. (b)

Bronfenbrenner, U. Reaction to social pressure from adults versus peers among Soviet day school and boarding school pupils in the perspective of an American sample. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 179-189. (b)

Bronfenbrenner, U. Testing group differences among correlated variables: an application of multiple regression. Mimeographed. Cornell University, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Ithaca, New York, 1973.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Developmental research, public policy, and the ecology of childhood. Child Development, March 1974.

Bronfenbrenner, U. and Devereux, E.C. Family authority structure and adolescent behavior. Proceedings of the XVI International Congress of Psychology. Bonn, Germany, 1960. Reprinted in Acta Psychologica, 1961, 19, 414-417.

Bronfenbrenner, U., Devereux, E.C., Suci, G.J., and Rodgers, R.R. Adults and peers as sources of conformity and autonomy. Paper presented at Conference on Socialization for Competence, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council, Puerto Rico, April, 1965.

Christie, R. and Geis, R. Studies in Machiavellianism. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Devereux, E.C. Children of democracy: On the consequences for children of varying patterns of family authority in the United States and West Germany. Paper presented to 7th International Seminar on Family Research, Washington, D.C. September, 1962. (a)

Devereux, E.C. Family authority and child behavior in West Germany and the United States: Some problems and strategies in a cross-national validation study. Transactions of Fifth World Congress of Sociology, Washington, D.C., 1962. International Sociological Association, 1964, Vol. IV, 303-312. (b)

Devereux, E.C. L'allevamento dei figli in Germania e negli USA. Murcurio: Sintesi Del Pensiero Ecnomico E Sociale Contemporaneo. (Rome, Italy), July, 1963, VI, 7, 75-82.

Devereux, E.C. Permissiveness versus control: A false dilemma. In Pre-Adolescents - Why Is Each One Different? Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, Coop. Extension Service. September, 1964, pp. 7-17.

Devereux, E.C. The role of the family in youth education. In The Role of The Family in the Process of Social Learning of Young People. Munich, Germany: UNESCO Institut der Jugend, 1965, pp. 45-59.

Devereux, E.C. Authority, guilt and conformity to adult standards among German school children: a pilot experimental study. Paper presented to Upstate New York Sociological Association, Rochester, N.Y., May, 1966.

Devereux, E.C. The role of peer group experience in moral development. In J.P. Hill (Ed.), Minnesota Symposia in Child Psychology, Vol. IV. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1970, pp. 94-140. (a)

Devereux, E.C. Socialization in cross-cultural perspective: Comparative study of England, Germany and the United States. In R. Hill and R. Konig, (eds.), Families in East and West: Socialization Process and Kinship Ties, Paris: Mouton, 1970, pp. 72-106. (b)

Devereux, E.C. Autoritat und moralische Entwicklung bei Deutschen and Amerikanischen Kindern: Eine interkulturelle Leitstudie , in G. Luschen and E. Lupri (Eds.) Soziologie der Familie, Opladen, Germany: Westdeutschen Verlag, 1970, pp. 353-379. Reprinted in English in Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 1972, 3, 99-124.

Devereux, E.C., Jr., Bronfenbrenner, U., and Rodgers, R.R. Child rearing in England and the United States: A cross-national comparison. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1969, 31, (2), 257-270.

Devereux, E.C., Jr., Bronfenbrenner, U., and Suci, G.J. Patterns of parent behavior in America and West Germany: A cross-national comparison. International Social Science Journal, 1962, XIV, 3, 488-506. Published in German as "Aum Verhalten der Eltern in der Vereingten Staaten." In Ludwig v. Rriedenburg (Ed.), Jugend in der Modernen Gesellschaft. Koeln, Kiepenheur and Witsch, 1965. Pp. 335-358.

Devereux, E.C., Jr., Shouval, R., Bronfenbrenner, U., Rodgers, R.R., Kav Venaki, S., Kiely, E., and Karson, E. Socialization practices of parents, teachers and peers in Israel: The kibbutz versus the city. Child Development, 45, 269-281.

Eisenstadt, S.N. Israeli Society. London: Neidenfeld and Nicholson, 1967.

Faigin, Helen. Social behavior of young children in the kibbutz. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, (1), 117-129.

Garbarino, J. Alienation and Educational Institutions. Albany, New York: Report to the New York State Assembly Scientific Advisory Committee, 1973. (a)

Garbarino, J. The impact of anticipated reward upon cross-age tutoring. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University, 1973. (b)

Garbarino, J. and Bronfenbrenner, U. An ecological interpretation of an experiment in college teaching. Unpublished manuscript, 1973, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, Department of Human Development and Family Studies.

Garbarino, J. and Bronfenbrenner, U. The socialization of moral judgment and behavior in cross-cultural perspective. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Morality: A handbook of moral development and behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1975.

Gerson, M. Family. In A. Jarus, J. Marcus, J. Oren, and C. Rapoport (Eds.), Children and Families in Israel. New York: Gordon and Breach, 1970.

Gewirtz, H.B. and Gewirtz, J.L. Visiting and caretaking patterns for kibbutz infants: Age and sex trends. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1968, 38, (3), 427-443.

Irvine, E.E. Observations on the aims and methods of child rearing in communal settlements in Israel. Human Relations, 1952, 5, 247-276.

Irvine, E.E. Children in kibbutzim: Thirteen years after. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 1966, 7, (3-4), 167-178.

Karson, E. The impact of socialization setting and ethnic origin on autonomy and locus of control in Israeli pre-adolescents. Undergraduate Honors Thesis, Cornell University, 1973.

Kav Venaki, S., Karson, E., Bernstein, E. and Eyal, N. The effect of Russian versus Hebrew instructions on the reaction to social pressure of Russian-born Israeli children. Unpublished manuscript, 1974, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, Department of Human Development and Family Studies.

Kleinberger, A.F. Society, Schools and Progress in Israel. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1969.

Kugelmass, S. and Breznitz, S. The development of intentionality in moral judgment in city and kibbutz adolescents. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1967, 111, (1), 103-111.

Long, B.H., Henderson, E.H., and Platt, L. Self-other orientations of Israeli adolescents reared in kibbutzim and moshavim. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 8, 300-308.

Luscher, K. Dreizehnjahrige schweizer peers und erwachsenen im interkulturellen vergleich (Peer-adult conflicts of thirteen year old Swiss children viewed in cross-cultural perspective). Schweizerische Zeitschrift fur Psychologie und ihre Anwendungen Revue Suisse de Psychologie Pure et Appliquee, 1971, 219-229.

Maccoby, E.E. and Feldman, S.S. Mother-attachments and stranger reactions in the third year of life: The kibbutz study. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1972, 37, 64-82.

Nachamie, S. Machiavellianism in children: The children's Mach scale and the bluffing game. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1969.

Neibauer, P.B. (Ed.), Children in Collectives: Child Rearing Aims and Practices in the Kibbutz. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1965.

Parsons, E.I. Children of Kfar Blum. Midstream: A Quarterly Jewish Review, 1959, 3, (5).

Rabin, A.I. Personality maturity of kibbutz and non-kibbutz Israeli boys. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1957, 21, 148-153. (a)

Rabin, A.I. The Israeli kibbutz as a "laboratory" for testing psycho-dynamic hypotheses. Psychological Records, 1957, 7, 111-115. (b)

Rabin, A.I. Kibbutz children: Research findings to date. Children, 1958, 5, 179-185. (a)

Rabin, A.I. Infants and children under conditions of "intermittent" mothering in the kibbutz. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1958, 28, 577-584. (b)

Rabin, A.I. Some psychosexual differences between kibbutz and non-kibbutz Israeli boys. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1958, 22, 328-332. (c)

Rabin, A.I. Attitudes of kibbutz children to family and parents. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1959, 29, 172-179.

Rabin, A.I. Kibbutz adolescents. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1961, 31, 493-504.

Rabin, A.I. Growing Up In The Kibbutz. New York: Springer Publishing Company, Inc., 1965.

Rettig, K.S. Relation of social systems to inter-generational changes in moral attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, (4), 409-414.

Rettig, S. and Pasamanick, B. Some observations on the moral ideology of first and second generation collective and non-collective settlers in Israel. Social Problems, 1963, 11, (2), 165-178.

Rodgers, R.R., Bronfenbrenner, U., and Devereux, E.C. Standards of social behavior among children in four cultures. International Journal of Psychology, 1968, 3, 31-41.

Rodgers, R.R. Changes in parental behavior reported by children in West Germany and the United States. Human Development, 1971, 14, 208-224.

Rodgers, R.R. Family Authority Structure and the Disposition to Inform on Peers Among Urban Children in West Germany and Israel. Paper presented at the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, September, 1972.

Shapira, A. and Madsen, M.C. Cooperative and competitive behavior of kibbutz and urban children in Israel. Child Development, 1969, 40, 609-618.

Sharabany, R. Intimacy of friendship in city and kibbutz. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University, 1974.

Shouval, R. Autonomy: Construction of a multiple-choice instrument. Tel Aviv University, 1971. (Accepted for publication, Journal of Personality Assessment.)

Shouval, R., Kav Venaki, S., Bronfenbrenner, U., Devereux, E.C., and Kiely, E. Anomalous behavior of Soviet and Israeli children under peer and parent pressure. Unpublished manuscript, 1974, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, Department of Human Development and Family Studies.

Shuval, J. Immigrants on the Threshhold. New York: Atherton Press, 1963.

Spiro, M.E. Is the family universal? American Anthropologist, 1954, 56, 839-846.

Spiro, M.E. Education in a communal village in Israel. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1955, 25, 283-292.

Spiro, M.E. Kibbutz: Venture in Utopia. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Spiro, M.E. The Sabras and Zionism: A study in personality and ideology. Social Problems, 1957, 5, 100-109.

Spiro, M.E. Children of the Kibbutz. Cambridge: Harvard University Press,1958.

Spiro, M.E. Is the family universal? - Addendum. In N.W. Bell and E.F. Vogel (Eds.), A Modern Introduction to the Family, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960, 64-75.

Talmon-Garber, Y. Social differentiation in cooperative communities. British Journal of Sociology, 1952, 3, 339-357.

Talmon-Garber, Y. The family in Israel. Marriage and Family Living, 1954, 16.

Talmon-Garber, Y. The family in collective settlements. The Third World Congress of Sociology, 1956, 4.

Talmon-Garber, Y. Social structure and family size. Human Relations, 1959, 12.

Talmon-Garber, Y. Social change and family structure. International Social Science Journal, 1963, 14, (3), 468-487.

Talmon-Garber, Y. Mate selection in collective settlements. American Sociological Review, 1964, 29, (4), 491-508.

Talmon-Garber, Y. Sex-role differentiation in an equalitarian society. In T.G. Lasswell, J. Burma, and S. Aronson (Eds.), Life in Society. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1965.

Tietjen, A. Sex differences in the relationship between socialization and informing behavior in city and kibbutz children in Israel. Unpublished manuscript, 1973, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, Department of Human Development and Family Studies.

Tsur, M. What is Kibbutz? Israel: Federation of Kibbutzim, 1972.

Wolins, M. Group care: Friend or foe. Social Work, 1969, 14, (1), 35-53. (a)

Wolins, M. The kibbutz as foster mother: Maimonides applied. Paper presented at the 46th Annual Meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, New York, 1969. (b)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Description of Sample

Table 1: WAVE I KIBBUTZ SAMPLE

Kibbutz Name	Class #	Grade	Number of Boys	Number of Girls	Total N	Kibbutz Federation[1]	Size[2]	Generation[3]	Sleeping Arrangements[4]
Gvat	1	6	3	6	9	Meuchad	Lrg.	III	Children
Tzorah	1	5	5	4	9	Ichud	Med.	II	Parents
	2	6	3	5	8				
Ein-Hamifratz	1	6	6	7	13	Artzi	Lrg.	II	Children
Mazuba	1	6	3	10	13	Ichud	Med.	II	Chidlren
Mayan Baruch	1	6	6	2	8	Ichud	Sm.	II	Children
Maabarot	1	6	8	6	14	Artzi	Lrg.	III	Children
Gat	1	6	10	4	14	Artzi	Med.	II	Children
Genigar	1		2	3	5	Ichud	Med.	III	Children
Genosar	1	5	4	3	7	Meuchad	Med.	II	Children
	2	6	4	3	7				
Kfar-Sold	1	6	7	3	10	Meuchad	Med.	II	Children
Chazor	1	6	13	5	18	Artzi	Lrg.	II	Children
Yakum	1	6	6	7	13	Artzi	Med.	II	Children
Kineret	1	6	4	5	9	Ichud	Lrg.	III	Children
Gesher-Haziv	1	5	5	7	12	Ichud	Sm.	I	Parents
Dorrat	1	5	5	6	11	Ichud	Sm.	II	Children
Affek	1	6	7	3	10	Meuchad	Med.	II	Children
Beit-Hashita	1	5	5	13	18	Meuchad	Lrg.	III	Children
Kfar-Blum	1	5	6	4	10	Ichud	Lrg.	II	Children
Lahavot-Habashan	1	6	5	7	12	Artzi	Sm.	II	Children
Beit-Keshet	1	6	6	7	13	Meuchad	Sm.	II	Children
Chefziba	1	6	8	7	15	Meuchad	Lrg.	III	Children
Ein-Shemer	1	5	9	10	19	Artzi	Lrg.	III	Children
Givat Chaim	1	6	2	5	7	Meuchad	Lrg.	II	Children
Einat	1	6	9	2	11	Ichud	Lrg.	III	Children
Ayelet Hashachar	1	6	3	3	6	Ichud	Lrg.	III	Children
Dafna	1	6	4	4	8	Meuchad	Lrg.	II	Children
Maayan Zvi	1	6	4	8	12	Ichud	Med.	II	Children
Mashabei Sadeh	1	6	7	8	15	Meuchad	Sm.	II	Children
Chanita	1	6	4	8	12	Ichud	Med.	II	Children
Gaaton	1	6	6	5	11	Artzi	Sm.	II	Children
Reshafim	1	6	8	9	17	Artzi	Med.	II	Children
Matsuba	1	5	5	7	12	Ichud	Med.	II	Children
TOTAL			192	196	388				

1 Of the three federations, Artzi is the most socialist or left-wing; Ichud is farthest right.

2 Small = fewer than 100 adult members; Medium = 100-300 members; Large = more than 300 members.

3 This classification corresponds to how long the settlement has been in existence. In second generation kibbutzim, our subjects are children of the founders; in third, they are their grandchildren.

4 Children sleep either in children's houses or at home with their parents.

Table 2: WAVE I CITY SAMPLE [1]

School #	Class #	Number of Boys	Number of Girls	Total N
1	1	20	20	40
1	2	21	20	41
1	3	22	17	39
2	1	18	16	34
2	2	17	15	32
2	3	15	16	31
3	1	17	17	34
3	2	18	15	33
3	3	14	18	32
		162	154	316

[1] Only Tel-Aviv was included in the Wave I city sample.

Table 3: WAVE II KIBBUTZ SAMPLE

#	Name	Federation[1]	# of Members	Size[2]	Date Established	Generation[3]	Block Order[4]	Fifth Grade			Sixth Grade			Seventh Grade			Total		
								Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
1	Ayelet Hashahar	I	450	L	1916	3	ACB	-	-	-	4	6	10	3	4	7	7	10	17
2	Einat	I	300	L	1952	2	BCA	-	-	-	7	3	10	9	5	14	16	8	24
3	Givat Brenner	M	1000	L	1928	3	ACB	9	12	21	12	6	18	5	7	12	26	25	51
4	Gvat	M	380	L	1927	3	BCA	6	5	11	4	4	8	2	6	8	12	15	27
5	Beit Alpha	A	430	L	1922	3	ACB	4	9	13	5	7	12	-	-	-	9	16	25
6	Mishmar Haemek	A	400	L	1922	3	BCA	-	-	-	10	4	14	-	-	-	10	4	14
7	Naot Mordechai	I	350	L	1946	2	ACB	-	-	-	7	6	13	6	5	11	13	11	24
8	Hanita	I	215	M	1938	2	BCA	4	7	11	-	-	-	3	6	9	7	13	20
9	Gesher	M	186	M	1939	2	ACB	3	5	8	-	-	-	8	5	13	11	10	21
10	Nachsholim	M	124	S	1948	2	BCA	-	-	-	5	9	14	-	-	-	5	9	14
11	Ruchama	A	317	L	1936	2	ACB	3	5	8	5	3	8	-	-	-	8	8	16
12	Shaar Hagolan	A	350	L	1937	2	BCA	4	5	9	6	6	12	-	-	-	10	11	21
13	Nachal Oz	I	140	S	1956	2	ACB	1	2	3	2	0	2	1	0	1	4	2	6
14	Mefalsim	I	170	M	1949	2	ACB	1	2	3	1	4	5	4	2	6	6	8	14
15	Mazuba	I	215	M	1941	2	BCA	6	6	12	-	-	-	7	5	12	13	11	24
16	Netiv Halamed Hey	M	136	S	1949	2	ACB	8	8	16	-	-	-	4	2	6	12	10	22
17	Manara	M	125	S	1943	2	BCA	5	6	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	6	11
18	Meggido	A	115	S	1949	2	ACB	5	4	9	8	5	13	-	-	-	13	9	22
19	Baram	A	147	S	1949	2	BCA	8	7	15	-	-	-	7	5	12	15	12	27
Sleep At Home Kibbutzim																			
20	Zorah	I	235	M	1946	2	ACB	7	1	8	-	-	-	7	2	9	14	3	17
21	Gesher Haziv	I	178	M	1949	2	ACB	-	-	-	5	8	13	-	-	-	5	8	13
22	Ein Harod	M	450	L	1923	3	BCA	6	6	12	4	6	10	-	-	-	10	12	22
23	Urim	I	182	M	1946	2	BCA	7	5	12	9	10	19	-	-	-	16	15	31
								87	95	182	94	87	181	66	54	120	247	236	483

[1] A=Artzi, the most socialist or left-wing of the kibbutz federations; M=Meuchad; I=Ichud, the farthest right of the three.

[2] Small=fewer than 160 adult members; Medium=160-200 members; Large=more than 200 members

[3] This classification refers to how long the settlement has been in existence. In second generation kibbutzim, our subjects are for the most part children of the founders; in third-generation settlements, they are their grandchildren.

[4] This refers to the order in which the questionnaire blocks were administered.

APPENDIX A

Table 4: WAVE II MOSHAV SAMPLE

#	Name	# of Members	Size[1]	Date Established	Generation[2]	Block Order[3]	Fifth Grade			Sixth Grade			Seventh Grade			Total		
							Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
24	Kfar Vitkin	840	L	1929	3	AC	8	2	10	4	6	10	-	-	-	12	8	20
25	Beit Hanan	186	M	1939	2	BA	1	0	1	3	2	5	5	1	6	9	3	12
26	Kfar Hanagid	300	L	1950	2	BA	1	5	6	2	2	4	1	3	4	4	10	14
27	Kfar Yehoshua	380	L	1927	3	BC	5	3	8	7	5	12	7	9	16	19	17	36
28	Kidron	550	L	1950	2	BA	4	4	8	7	7	14	7	6	13	18	17	35
29	Hayogev	190	M	1950	2	AC	4	3	7	5	3	8	-	-	-	9	6	15
31	Beit Elazari	300	L	1950	2	BA	1	3	4	2	3	5	2	3	5	5	9	14
32	Gealia	380	L	1948	2	BA	4	4	8	0	1	1	5	5	10	9	10	19
33	Nir Banim	150	S	1955	2	AC	8	5	13	4	7	11	-	-	-	12	12	24
34	Avigdor	290	L	1950	2	AC	2	0	2	7	6	13	-	-	-	9	6	15
35	Bnei Zion	100	S	1947	2	BC	5	5	10	0	4	4	-	-	-	5	9	14
36	Bazrah	150	S	1946	2	BC	1	3	4	4	3	7	-	-	-	5	6	11
49	Bnei Atarot	280	L	1948	2	BC	1	3	4	4	2	6	4	5	9	9	10	19
50	Mazor	175	M	1949	2	BC	3	4	7	2	0	2	2	3	5	7	7	14
							48	44	92	51	51	102	33	35	68	132	130	262

[1] Small=Fewer than 160 adult members; Medium=160-200 members; Large=more than 200 members.

[2] This classification corresponds to how long the settlement has been in existence. In second generation moshavim, our subjects are for the most part the children of the founders; in third-generation settlements, they are their grandchildren.

[3] This refers to the order in which the questionnaire blocks were administered.

APPENDIX A

Table 5: WAVE II CITY SAMPLE

#	City	School	1971 City Population	City Size[1]	School Size[2]	Block Order[3]	Fifth Grade Boys	Fifth Grade Girls	Fifth Grade Total	Sixth Grade Boys	Sixth Grade Girls	Sixth Grade Total	Seventh Grade Boys	Seventh Grade Girls	Seventh Grade Total	Total Boys	Total Girls	Total Total
37	Natanya	Bialik	46,200	L	L	AC	17	21	38	16	22	38	14	21	35	47	64	111
38	Nahariyah	Weitzman	15,900	S	L	BA	20	14	34	16	13	29	16	19	35	52	46	98
39	Ramat Gan	Hillel	95,800	L	L	BC	17	20	37	23	16	39	21	12	33	61	48	109
40	Tel-Aviv	Yehuda Hamakal	394,000	L	L	AC	15	12	27	17	23	40	14	13	27	46	48	94
41	Givatayim	Metsada	30,932	L	L	BA	14	20	34	18	15	33	18	19	37	50	54	104
42	Beer Sheba	Nitzanim	51,600	L	L	BC	18	20	38	21	13	34	12	14	26	51	47	98
43	Petach Tikvah	Yad Levanim	58,700	L	S	AC	14	14	28	22	14	36	11	14	25	47	42	89
44	Hadera	Arlozorov	27,200	S	S	BA	20	15	35	13	16	29	17	18	35	50	49	99
45	Tveriyah (Tiberias)	Mamlachti-D	22,300	S	S	BC	23	14	37	20	15	35	17	19	36	60	48	108
46	Zfat	Mamlachti-A	11,500	S	S	AC	15	18	33	15	13	28	11	22	33	41	53	94
47	Ashdod	Gevlim	11,700	S	S	BA	22	17	39	17	19	36	17	14	31	56	50	106
48	Ashketon	Beit Yehezkel	28,400	S	S	BC	15	19	34	21	19	40	16	12	28	52	50	102
							210	204	414	219	198	417	184	197	381	613	599	1212

[1] The dividing line between large and small cities was set at 30,000 population.

[2] Small schools have one or two classes at each grade level; large schools have three or more.

[3] This refers to the order in which the questionnaire blocks were administered.

APPENDIX B

"Socialization Practices of Parents, Teacher, and Peers in Israel: The Kibbutz versus the City" by Edward C. Devereux, Ron Shouval, Urie Bronfenbrenner, Robert R. Rodgers, Sophie Kav-Venaki, Elizabeth Kiely, and Esther Karson, Child Development, 1974, 45, 269-281. This article removed in compliance with copyright law.

APPENDIX C

"Testing for Group Differences Among Correlated Variables: An Application of Multiple Regression"

Urie Bronfenbrenner

Bronfenbrenner-- July 9, 1973

Testing Group Differences Among Correlated Variables: An Application of Multiple Regression

A. Procedure

Purpose. The procedure here outlined may be employed to identify significant, statistically independent main effects and interactions involving group differences broken down into single degrees of freedom (e.g. a difference between two cultures). In algebraic terms:

y=Group A vs. B, coded 0,1 as a dummy variable
x_i= one or more variables of primary interest
w_i= one or more control variables

The procedure involves testing for a group difference in a particular X_i controlling for any or all W_i's, and if so desired, for any other X_i's. Thus one may determine how many different X_i's make a statistically independent contribution to discriminating between groups A and B either as main effects or as combined effects and interactions.

General Procedure. The method consists of several stages each building on the results of the preceeding. We shall illustrate the procedure by applying it to the analyses of group differences in socialization practices by four different agents (mother (M) father (F) teacher (T) and peers (P)) on a series of variables previously grouped by factor analysis into two general clusters- Support and Discipline. The general question thus becomes: Are there group differences specific to particular agents, clusters, and variables within clusters? Input scores are classroom means separately by sex.

Determine control variables by correlations of potential candidates with the dependent variable. Run separately by sex. Retain significant control variables for future stages.

Stage I. Identifying Interactions by Sex of Child (Bvs G)

1.Set y as the dependent variable, fix all W's* and set as inde-

*as B+G scores unless the control variable is presumed to operate differentially for the two sexes, and we wish to control on the differential effect.

pendent variables X_i's for all item and cluster scores in the form of sex differences (B-G) for each of the following agents or agent combinations:

a. M, F, ~~M+F~~, P, T.

b. M-F, P-T, M-T, M-P, P-T, F-P.

2. Terminate each of the above regressions just before the first X_i is taken and examine the partial correlations ($r_{y\,x_i.w}$) at that point. Partials significant at the 5% level identify reliable interactions by sex of child.

Stage II. Identifying Main Effects and Interactions by Agent

1. Repeat the first operation in Stage I above, but in place of B-G substitute.

a. B+G for any agent or agent combination for which no more than two interactions by sex were found.

b. Separate B and G runs for any agent or agent combination for which more than two significant interactions by sex were found.

2. For all agent-difference scores (e.g. M-F, P-T) terminate regression before the first X_i is taken. For all single agent and ~~M+F~~ scores continue regression with F set at the 10% level.

a. For all agent-difference runs, examine partials before the first X_i is taken. Significant partials identify reliable interactions by agents (If no such effects are found whatsoever, scores should be pooled across all agents and reanalyzed as above).

b. If M-F scores showed significant partials in 2a above, M and F scores should be looked at separately below; ~~if~~ no M-F scores were significant, ~~M+F~~ scores may be treated as indices of undifferentiated, joint parental behavior.

c. For all single agent scores, significant partials before first X_i is taken identify reliable main effects.

d. For P, T, and M+F (or M and F) scores, examine partials after first X_i is taken. Significant values identify X_j's that combine with X_i to produce a group difference. Some of these X_j's will already have been identified previously as main effects; others will be new. The latter constitute variables that account for group differences only in combination with X_i and should be noted as such for later reference.

Stage III. Identifying Independent Effects by Cluster and Variable

1. For each agent separately, any cluster or variable identified as a significant main effect above is taken as the primary independent variable (X_i) in a regression equation in which Y is the dependent variable, all W_i's are fixed, highest priority is given to X_i, next highest to other X_i's from the same cluster previously identified as significant, with non-significant items in that cluster given lowest priority. This procedure is carried out for all significant main effect X_i's, except any for which the requisite run is already available from Stage II above.

   a. At the point at which X_i is taken, any significant partials identify variables that contribute to a group difference in combination with X_i. All significant X_i's not previously identified as main effects should be noted accordingly.

   b. In the case in which X_i is a cluster, any significant X_i's indicate that group differences exist for specific variables within the cluster. If no X_i's are taken, the cluster is retained as such.

   c. Subsequent steps in the above regressions provide information useful in Stage IV.

Stage IV. Adjusted Group Differences and Means

For each agent and variable, set X_i as dependent variable and fix Y and all W's (or X_j's if desired). The adjusted group difference D' is given by the partial regression coefficient for Y, $b_{x_i y \cdot w_i x_j}$. Adjusted group means are then calculated by the following formulas:

$$\bar{X}_\alpha = \bar{\bar{X}} - \frac{n_\beta D'}{N}$$

$$\bar{X}_\beta = \bar{\bar{X}} + \frac{n_\alpha D'}{N}$$

Where $\bar{X}_\alpha$ or $\bar{X}_\beta$ =adjusted mean for group α or β, $\bar{\bar{X}}$=overall mean.

n_α =number of observations in group α.

n_β =number of observations in group β.

$N = n_\alpha + n_\beta$.

Stage V. Forming Best Regressions

1. On the basis of previous regression runs, especially in Stage III, select, or construct if necessary a hypothesis regression which whould hopefully yield the highest multiple regression in which all X_i components are significant, with main effects being given higher priority than combined effects. This procedure is carried out separately for each cluster and for all clusters combined. More than one run may be necessary to establish the best regression. For hypothesis regressions set F at 10% level, for final regression record at 5% level.

2. If two or more variables (X_i and X_j) appear in a best regression which were not previously identified as a combined effect, check for this possibility by setting Y as dependent variable and fixing all W's, X_i and X_j. If both are taken, they are added to the roster of combined effects.

Stage VI. Confirming Interaction Effects

For each combined effect identified in stages III and V(2), set Y as dependent variable, fix all W's, express all combined variables as difference scores $d_{ij}=X_i-X_j$. Terminate regression before any d_{ij} is taken. Any significant partial correlations identify interactions in which the two partial b's differ significantly, and hence $D_i \neq D_j$. In all remaining combined effects, components do not have significantly different weights; hence not true interaction is present.

B. DATA TO BE REPORTED

I. Adjusted Means and Differences by Agents

For each variable for every agent (Peer, Teacher, Parent or Mother and Father separately), for both sexes, or boys and girls separately (depending on whether sex by cohort interactions are significant), report corrected means and mean differences between cohorts, adjusted for control variables. Significance levels of mean differences are indicated.

II. Interactions of Cohort by Sex or Agent

For each interaction by sex (B-G), agent (M-F, M-T, M-P, F-P, F-T, P-T), or their combination. Report only those variables showing significant effects, giving partial correlation after controls (e.g. age).

III. Partial Correlations for Main Effects and Combined Variable Effects.

Separately for each agent, record every variable that combines significantly with a main effect by noting partial correlations, first for the main effect and then for each combined variable. Underline any combined variable that is not a main effect. Add any additional combined effects revealed in Stage V (2) of procedure section.

IV. Significant Interactions Among Combined Variables.

For each pair of combined variables reported as significant in III above, identify interactions (partials for $X_i - X_j$ after controls) by noting partial correlation with sign and significance level. (Include halos only if not fractured).

V. Best Regressions

Record best regressions for each cluster and overall based in each case on combined effect having highest partial coefficients first for the main effect and then the combined variable. Include partial b's and R^2 with main effects (largest first) preceding combined variables.

APPENDIX D

"The Anomalous Reactions to Social Pressure of Israeli and Soviet Children Raised in Family versus Collective Settings"

Ron Shouval, Sophie Kav-Venaki, Urie Bronfenbrenner, Edward C. Devereux, and Elizabeth Kiely

ABSTRACT

This experiment investigates reaction to social pressure among Israeli (N=400) and Soviet (N=353) 12-year-olds brought up in family vs. collective settings (kibbutz in Israel, boarding school in the U.S.S.R.). Consistent with the first major hypothesis of the study, Russian children showed higher levels of conformity than their Israeli agemates. Cultural differences, sex differences, and effect of threatened social exposure were greater for youngsters raised in collective settings than for those brought up in their own homes. Contrary to stated hypotheses, kibbutz-reared children did not react in the same way as products of Soviet group upbringing, but Israeli children generally did resemble Russian agemates in reacting similarly to pressure from peers vs. adults. But they differed sharply from their Soviet counterparts, as well as children from 10 other countries, by giving their most moral responses when neither their parents nor their friends would know of their action. These findings are interpreted as reflecting the unity created by an overriding concern with national survival and the emphasis placed by Israelis on the development of moral autonomy and independence of action on the part of children and youth.

THE ANOMALOUS REACTIONS TO SOCIAL PRESSURE OF ISRAELI AND SOVIET CHILDREN RAISED IN FAMILY VS. COLLECTIVE SETTINGS[1]

Ron Shouval and Urie Bronfenbrenner
Sophie Kav Venaki Edward C. Devereux
Tel Aviv University Elizabeth Kiely
Cornell University

This study reports the results of an experiment on the effects of social pressure on children from two societies with widely differing systems of child rearing both between and within cultures. The countries in question are Israel and the Soviet Union; the systems of upbringing are those of family vs. collective. In each society, samples have been drawn from two contrasting child rearing environments. The first is the conventional context of the home; the second, also found in both societies, is the children's collective. In Israel, this setting is represented by the kibbutz; in the Soviet Union it appears in most pronounced form in the boarding school. Under both collective arrangements, children sleep outside the home, the children's peer group constitutes a major context and instrument of upbringing, and substantial responsibility for child rearing is vested in an upbringer specially selected for the task -- the metapelet in the Israeli kibbutz and the vospitatel in the Soviet boarding school.

Thus the design of the study focuses on two major contrasts and their interplay. It permits an assessment of the relative impact of culture (Israeli vs. Soviet) as against context of upbringing (family vs. collective) on children's reaction to social pressure. In addition, the results will be examined in the perspective of data from a dozen countries in which the same experiment on effects of social pressure has now been carried out. These nations are concentrated in Eastern and Western Europe, but also include Japan, Canada, and the United States.

Experimental Procedure

Before considering possible and actual results, a brief description of the experimental method is in order.[2] Children in classroom settings were asked to respond to a series of conflict situations under three different conditions: (a) a base condition, in which they were told that no one would see their responses except the investigators conducting the research; (b) an adult condition, in which they were informed that the responses of everyone in the class would be posted on a chart and shown to parents at a special meeting scheduled for the following week; and (c) a peer condition, in which the children were notified

that the chart would be prepared and shown a week later to the class itself. The order of the last two conditions was counterbalanced.

The conflict situations consisted of 30 hypothetical dilemmas such as the following:

The Lost Test

You and your friends accidentally find a sheet of paper which the teacher must have lost. On this sheet are the questions and answers for a quiz that you are going to have tomorrow. Some of the kids suggest that you not say anything to the teacher about it, so that all of you can get better marks. What would you really do? Suppose your friends decide to go ahead. Would you go along with them or refuse?

Refuse to go along with my friends			Go along with my friends		
absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain

Other items dealt with such situations as going to a movie recommended by friends but disapproved by parents, standing guard while friends put a rubber snake in the teacher's desk, joining friends in pilfering fruit from an orchard with a "no trespassing" sign, running away after breaking a window accidentally while playing ball, etc. In short, each time the child was confronted with choosing between some conventional standard of "moral" behavior presumably approved by adults and some mildly "anti-social" or at least mischievous action urged by his peers. Information on the development of the measuring instrument, factorial structure, and procedures employed for insuring equivalence

across cultures (e.g., back translation) is provided in earlier publications (Bronfenbrenner, 1967, 1970a).

Each response was scored on a scale from -2.5 to +2.5, a negative value being assigned to the behavior urged by agemates. To control for a positional response set, scale direction was reversed in half of the items. The situations were divided into three alternate forms of 10 items each. Under any one condition a child could obtain a score ranging from -25 to +25 with zero representing equal division between behavior urged by peers and adults. Split-half reliabilities for the 10-item forms (based on American samples only) ranged from .75 to .86 under different experimental conditions; the reliability of the total score (i.e., sum across all three conditions) was .94. All reliability coefficients are corrected for length of test by the Spearman-Brown formula.

A measure of orientation toward adults vs. peers is thus obtained for each of the three experimental conditions. The base score is taken as the point of departure for gauging the effects of social pressure. The adult score is presumed to reflect most directly the child's view of his parents' norms for the appropriateness of his behavior. The peer score is interpreted as a function of the expectations of agemates. The three scores can also be combined in various ways. The total score across the three conditions measures the general tendency of the child to subscribe to adult- vs. peer-approved alternatives. The difference between adult and peer scores (A-P) measures the extent to which children give more adult-approved responses when told their answers will be known to parents rather than to peers; thus the score reflects the per-

ceived discrepancy or convergence of adult and peer standards and expectations. Finally, a second and statistically independent difference score, and one which turns out to be particularly significant for the Israeli-Soviet contrast, is that between performance under the base condition and under the two experimental conditions taken together. Expressed as the difference between the latter and the former (E-B), this score reflects the extent to which children shift their response toward (or away from) claimed conformity to conventional moral values when told their answers will become known to others, whether peers or adults.

Rationale and Hypotheses

Our theoretical speculations about the outcome of the cross-cultural comparison were hardly a priori, since they were heavily influenced by the fact that half of the data had already been analyzed and previously published. The so-called "dilemmas experiment" had been carried out several years earlier with two samples of Soviet sixth-graders (Bronfenbrenner, 1967, 1970a), one drawn from three different boarding schools in Moscow, the other from three regular day schools in the same or similar neighborhoods. The responses of the Soviet children were compared with those of their agemates from three American schools.

The experimental results were consistent with the major hypotheses proposed for those investigations. Three dealt with the cross-cultural contrast between the Soviet and American children, the remaining four with differences anticipated within Soviet society between pupils attending boarding school vs. day school.

In the former category, the first hypothesis was based on the strong emphasis accorded in Soviet upbringing, both in the home and in the school, to the development of conventional virtues such as obedience and propriety (Bronfenbrenner, 1962, 1970b). It was therefore anticipated, and strongly confirmed, that Russian children would obtain markedly higher scores under all three experimental conditions. Indeed, there was not only a marked difference in mean score between the Soviet and American samples (averaging from 12 to 15 points), but scarcely any overlap in the two distributions.

The second and third hypotheses took as their point of departure the fact that in the U.S.S.R., in contrast to America, an explicit effort is made to utilize the peer group as an agent for socializing the child and bringing about an identification with the values of the adult society (Bronfenbrenner, idem). On this basis, a differential pattern of response to the three experimental conditions was predicted for American and Soviet children. The former were expected to obtain their highest score under pressure from adults, the lowest when told that their answers would be seen by their friends, with the base condition falling in between. In contrast, Russian youngsters were expected to react similarly to pressure from parents and peers, in each case shifting their responses in the direction of claimed conformity to conventional moral standards, and thus scoring lowest under the base condition. In terms of difference scores, the Americans should obtain a significantly higher mean on A-P, the Russians on E-B. The results were in the predicted direction, but reliably so only in the case of the E-B score.

In approaching the Soviet-Israeli comparison, we anticipated differences very similar to those obtained in our earlier comparison involving the United States. Thus it was clear both from the research of others (e.g., Eisenstadt, 1951, 1967) and from our own exploratory interviews and observations that, especially in comparison with the U.S.S.R., Israeli society was essentially Western in orientation. Its values were certainly less moralistic and more pluralistic, and child rearing practices appeared to vary accordingly. There was every reason to expect, therefore, that Israeli children -- at least those raised in the family as against collective settings -- would exhibit a pattern of response similar to that of their American agemates. It follows that the three hypotheses bearing on Israeli-Soviet differences in the present study were exactly parallel in form to their predecessors in the American-Russian comparison. The only change is the substitution of the adjective "Israeli" for "American." Specifically:

Hypothesis I. In comparison with Soviet youngsters, Israeli children will obtain significantly lower scores on conventional morality under all three experimental conditions.

Hypothesis II. Israeli pupils will show a greater discrepancy in response to pressure from adults vs. peers, with a higher score under the former experimental condition than the latter.

Hypothesis III. Whereas Russian children obtained their lowest scores under the base condition thus producing a significant and positive E-B difference, for the Israeli sample the average score on the base condition will fall midway between the other two, with the result that the E-B difference will approach zero.

Given the fact that we had already seen half of our data, all three of the foregoing hypotheses would seem assured of a high probability of support. We therefore hasten to reassure the reader that, for two of the three hypotheses, the results not only failed to support the predictions, but came out exactly opposite in direction. The source of the error turned out to be not methodological but substantive: the mistake of equating Israeli society with American, or -- for that matter -- with any other.

But we are getting ahead of our story. We have yet to consider a second set of hypotheses bearing on the differential impact of upbringing in the family vs. the collective. Here again, half of the data were already available to us: namely, the comparison of reactions to social pressure on the part of pupils from Soviet boarding schools vs. day schools. But inferences to the corresponding Israeli contrast between kibbutz- vs. family-reared children proved equivocal. An understanding of the difficulty requires a brief account of the derivation of the general hypothesis pertaining to the boarding vs. day school contrast in the original study. This hypothesis had been developed in the course of previous research on socialization in the American family (Bronfenbrenner, 1961). The underlying assumption was that exposure to divergent influences in the course of growing up makes it easier for the child to resist pressure to conform. Thus, a child who has been brought up by a single socializing agent (e.g., one parent instead of two) is not only likely to become more dependent but also more anxious at the prospect of differing from his sole source of emotional support.

In contrast, a child raised by more than one upbringer is more apt to learn that you "can't please everybody" and that deviation does not jeopardize one's major source of security. As a result, the child reared by multiple agents may not subscribe as fervently to his upbringers' values but is more likely to remain true to his own views, whatever they may be, when these are subjected to pressure for change.

The contrast between boarding school and day school was seen as an opportunity to test the impact of what might be called pluralistic vs. monistic socialization at yet another level. Pupils in Soviet boarding schools are subject to a highly homogeneous pattern of socialization with minimum exposure to extraneous forces. In contrast, children attending regular day schools in the U.S.S.R., as in the United States, go home after school where they are subject to strong family influences. As a result they are given substantial exposure to two rather different systems of socialization instead of only one.

Within this frame of reference, four hypotheses had been formulated and tested in the original study (Bronfenbrenner, 1970a). First, children raised primarily in a single socialization setting (i.e., the boarding school) were expected to show stronger adherence to conventional moral values than their agemates attending regular day schools. Second, given the fact that in the Soviet boarding school the peer collective is relied upon especially heavily as an agent of discipline, the difference in reaction to pressure from adults vs. peers should be even smaller for children raised in that setting than for those being brought up in families. In other words, the boarding school pupils

should react to pressure from peers in the same way as they react to pressure from adults. In statistical terms, the A-P difference should be closer to zero for boarding than for day school children. Third, if, as hypothesized, children brought up in a single socialization setting are not as likely to develop their own, internalized norms of behavior, then the boarding school pupils should obtain their lowest scores, i.e., be most ready to deviate from conventional moral standards, under the base condition, when their answers will not be shown to anyone they know. Again, in statistical terms, the E-B score should be higher for children reared in boarding schools than for those brought up in their own homes. Fourth, these differences within Soviet society, while significant, should nevertheless be smaller in magnitude than the differences between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.; in other words, inter-cultural variation should exceed intra-cultural. By and large, the results gave support to all four hypotheses.

Can we expect the same four relationships to obtain for the contrast between children raised in the family vs. the kibbutz in Israel? The answer to this question hinges on the validity both of the underlying theory and of the analogy between the two pairs of settings in each country. Even if we assume that exposure to a single rather than two or more socializing agents or contexts does increase the child's susceptibility to social pressure, is it correct to regard upbringing as less pluralistic in the kibbutz than in the family? In discussing this issue with experts on kibbutz education, we learned it was a question on which reasonable men can differ. There were those who argued, and cited historical documentary evidence, that principles and

methods of kibbutz upbringing had their roots in socialist and communist ideology and practices; for example, the work of Makarenko (1952, 1955), on which much of Soviet collective upbringing is based. Thus, the distinctive features of the classroom collective in the U.S.S.R., including the subordination of individual desires to group goals, group cohesiveness, and group criticism were also to be found, to be sure in a less intense form, in the 'kvutsa," the childrens' peer group in the kibbutz.

The counter-thesis, sometimes offered by the very same kibbutz experts, stressed the divergent course of socialist ideology in the U.S.S.R. and Israel resulting in marked differences in the theory and practice of collective upbringing in the two countries. In the Soviet educational system, it was argued, the individual has significance only as a member of a collective. In the kibbutz, while collective goals and values are respected, the rights and opinions of the individual are also protected, and indeed supported, much as they are in the rest of Israeli society. Moreover, kibbutz children have more extensive contacts with their parents than do children in the Soviet collectives, and the influences of parents may pull in different directions from those of the metapelet and the peer group. As a result, kibbutz children, in reacting to social pressure, should exhibit a pattern more closely resembling that of other Israeli youngsters than of Soviet pupils, including those attending boarding schools.

These differing conceptions of Israeli reality lead to alternative sets of hypotheses regarding the results of our experiment. One set,

stressing the continuity in the theory and practice of collective upbringing in Soviet communist society on the one hand and in the Israeli kibbutz on the other, predicts a pattern of differences between kibbutz- and family-reared Israeli children similar to that previously found for the contrast between boarding and day school pupils in the U.S.S.R. The second set of hypotheses emphasizes the commonality of values and methods of child rearing within Israeli society and hence anticipates little difference in reaction to social pressure on the part of children raised in the family vs. the kibbutz. It is clear that the two sets of hypotheses are mutually exclusive and reflect different assumptions about the empirical realities of socialization in contemporary Israel. In the absence of definitive data we shall arbitrarily state the first set only, which presumes an analogy between the family vs. kibbutz comparison in Israel and the day vs. boarding school contrast in the U.S.S.R.

Hypothesis IV. In Israel as in the Soviet Union, children raised primarily in collective settings will show greater conformity to conventional moral values than their agemates growing up in families. In terms of experimental measures, this means that the mean for total score across all three conditions should be higher for kibbutz children than for those brought up in their own families.

Hypothesis V. In Israel as in the Soviet Union, children growing up primarily in collective settings should tend to react in the same way to peers as to adults. In statistical terms, the A-P difference should be smaller for kibbutz-reared than for home-reared children.

Hypothesis VI. In Israel as in the Soviet Union, children growing up primarily in collective settings should be most likely to claim conformity to conventional moral values when told that others, either adults or peers, will know of their answers. In statistical terms, the E-B score should be higher for kibbutz-reared than for home-reared youngsters.

Hypothesis VII. The difference across settings within each society should be smaller than the differences between countries.

The last hypothesis is included to complete the parallelism with the previous comparison between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

Statistical Design

In both countries the basic research design took the form of a Latin square with experimental treatments constituting the three rows, classrooms appearing in the columns, and test forms assigned with the restriction that each form appear only once in each column and twice in each row. This basic pattern was repeated four times in each sample, twice for setting (family vs. collective) and twice for sex (boys vs. girls). In the Soviet Union six sixth-grade classrooms in the vicinity of Moscow were used in each setting for a total of 353 children; in Israel nine sixth-grade classrooms were used for each setting for a total of 400 youngsters. The kibbutz sample was selected so as to insure equal representation from each of the three major kibbutz federations; the children from the family setting were drawn from schools in predominantly middle class neighborhoods in Tel Aviv.

In order to equate for varying numbers of boys and girls in each classroom, the cell entries used for the primary analysis of variance were the mean scores obtained by all boys or girls in a given classroom under a particular experimental condition. In this mixed model, classrooms and forms were treated as random variables, and culture, context of upbringing (family vs. collective), experimental treatment, and sex of child as fixed effects.

For interpreting the results, the reader must bear in mind that a high mean score signifies a reported readiness to conform to conventional, adult-approved moral standards; a low score indicates readiness to engage in the mischievous or anti-social activity being urged by the peers described in the item itself. This does not mean, however, that the behavior in question is necessarily approved or disapproved by the particular adults or peers who supposedly get to see the child's responses under the experimental conditions. Indeed it is the purpose of the experimental procedure to reveal to what extent and in which direction the adults and peers in the child's world, as he sees them, do in fact influence his responses in a given situation.

Results

Table 1 shows the mean scores obtained by children from each country and setting under each of the three experimental conditions, as well as the total score across the three conditions, expressed as an average. Subsequent tables present the mean differences and accompanying

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

significance levels bearing on the several hypotheses. Thus Table 2 shows means, mean differences, and significance tests relevant to the question of whether children in the two societies and the two upbringing settings varied in their general tendency to conform to conventional moral standards across all three experimental conditions. Since reliable classroom differences in total score were found in both countries, the appropriate error term used for testing the two main effects and their interaction was the mean square for classrooms within settings.

Insert Table 2 about here

Turning first to the cross-cultural comparisons, which appear in the last column of Table 2, we find clear support for Hypothesis I that the Soviet children are much more prone to subscribe to adult-oriented alternatives than their Israeli counterparts. This difference obtains in both family and collective settings, but, as indicated by the reliable interaction effect appearing in the lower right hand corner of the table, it is larger in the latter context than in the former; in other words, the tendency for Soviet youngsters to outdo their Israeli agemates in giving moral answers was especially marked among the children raised in collective settings in the two countries.

With respect to the overall influence of family vs. collective, although the main effect (bottom entry in Column III) is significant, it is critically qualified by the above mentioned interaction. As we see in the first column of Table 2, Israeli children, in contrast to their Russian counterparts, showed no difference in score as a function

of upbringing setting; whether raised in the kibbutz or at home, they responded similarly to the series of dilemmas. The effect of family vs. collective upbringing was further qualified by sex of child. An additional analysis of variance (not shown) revealed that a significant difference existed in both countries for girls but not for boys; that is, girls raised in a collective setting conformed more than those brought up at home. This means that the results of our experiment provide support for Hypothesis IV, but for girls only.

It is instructive to look at this same interaction from the viewpoint of sex differences. It signifies that, in both countries, girls exceeded boys in conformity, but only when the children had been brought up in a collective setting. Whether in Russia or Israel, daughters reared at home did not differ significantly from sons. In other words, in both countries, sex differences in conformity were greater for children reared collectively than for those brought up in their own families.

In Tables 3 and 4, we analyze the effects of experimental treatment. Since these appear in the three rows of a Latin square design, the appropriate error term used was the discrepance or residual mean square. As already indicated, the two degrees of freedom for rows were broken up and analyzed separately. The first was the difference between means under the adult and peer conditions, shown in Table 3; the second, the shift from the base condition to the other two, documented in Table 4.

Insert Table 3 about here

The data of Table 3 do not conform with our expectations. Contrary to Hypothesis II, which predicted a significant shift for Israeli children in moving from adult to peer conditions, the first three A-P differences in Column I, while slightly positive, were all non-significant. More critically for our hypothesis, they were statistically indistinguishable, both in sign and magnitude, from the corresponding scores for Soviet children shown in Column II. Consistent with this fact, none of the associated cultural differences in Column IV was reliable. Hypothesis II must therefore be rejected.

The results presented in Table 3 are similarly negative with respect to the contrast between family and collective upbringing. Whether they had been brought up in family or collective, neither Israeli nor Soviet children differed in their ways of responding to pressures from adults vs. peers. Hypothesis V must therefore be rejected.

None of the foregoing findings was qualified by sex of child; that is, the results were negative for both girls and boys.

In summary, the results for the A-P score contradict the relevant Hypotheses (II and V) on all counts. The expected differences both across culture and setting failed to appear. Instead, much to our surprise, the pattern of response for Israeli children was identical to that previously exhibited by Soviet youngsters; namely, for both groups, changing the source of pressure from adults to peers did not produce any change in response. The unexpected similarity between Russian and Israeli children is all the more remarkable since in most other societies in which the dilemmas experiment has been conducted, changing the source

of pressure had produced a significant shift, with higher scores occurring under the adult condition. The finding that Israeli and Soviet children share the same atypical response pattern suggests the existence of some common feature in their systems of socialization. We shall give further consideration to this possibility in discussion to follow.

Results contradicting another initial hypothesis appear in Table 4, which deals with the remaining difference score, that between base condition and the two experimental conditions taken together. The pattern

---

Insert Table 4 about here

---

for Israeli children does indeed depart from the Soviet profile, but not in the expected fashion. Consider first the combined means shown in Row 3: in terms of our theoretical analysis, the mean on the base condition for Israeli children was expected to fall midway between the adult and peer conditions, with the E-B value approaching zero. Instead, it was in the base condition that Israeli children obtained their highest score; far from being zero, the E-B difference was reliably negative, thus standing in sharp contrast to the significant positive value of the corresponding score for the Russian sample. In substantive terms, this means that whereas Soviet children were most willing to say they might deviate from conventional moral standards when told that no one else would see their responses (except, of course, the investigators), it was under this same condition that Israeli youngsters gave their most moral answers. Moreover, in this respect the Israeli children differed not only from their Soviet counterparts, but, as we shall see,

from children in virtually every other society in which the dilemmas experiment has been carried out. Hypothesis III must therefore be rejected.

As indicated by the last entry in Column III, however, there, as expected, was a significant main effect associated with the setting in which the child was raised. In both countries, the tendency to give more moral responses under social pressure than under the base condition was greater for children brought up in collective settings than for those raised at home. The data thus support Hypothesis VI. An additional analysis (not shown) revealed that this trend was particularly marked for daughters. In both countries, it was girls raised in the collective who were most likely to shift their responses, when threatened with social exposure, in the direction of conventional moral standards.

Finally, the data shown in Tables 1-4 lend support to Hypothesis VII. In general, it is clear that the overall cultural differences which differentiate Soviet and Israeli children in their claimed conformity to conventional moral standards are of far greater magnitude than the within-culture differences associated with upbringing setting, sex, or experimental treatments.

Discussion

To illuminate the interpretation of our results, we now present them in the context of data from other countries in which the same ex-

---

Insert Table 5 about here

---

periment has now been carried out.[3] The cross-cultural findings are shown in Table 5. The countries are listed by rank of the average total score (Column I) obtained by the children in each sample across the three experimental conditions. The fact that Russian youngsters lead the list, whereas both Israeli samples are in the bottom third of the array, dramatizes the magnitude and social significance of the contrast in response by the children of these two nations. The reader will also be struck by the clustering of communist nations at the top of the distribution. In a forthcoming publication, Garbarino and Bronfenbrenner (1975) examine the relation, across 13 countries, between the average total score obtained in the dilemmas experiment and an index of socio-political pluralism developed by Vincent (1971). The index, derived from a factor analysis of the political characteristics of 121 nation-states, is based on such features as the presence of constitutional limitations on the executive, competitive elections, freedom for

oppositional parties, etc. The correlation between the two measures was a significant -.89; in substantive terms this means that the less pluralistic the political structure of the country, the more likely are its school children to subscribe to conventional moral values.

The contrasting position of Soviet and Israeli children in this cross-cultural perspective underscores the unequivocal support obtained for Hypothesis I. Russian youngsters, whether raised in family or collective, clearly conformed to conventional moral values in far greater degree than their Israeli counterparts.

With respect to Hypothesis II, however, Soviet and Israeli children not only failed to differ as predicted, but, as evidenced in Column IV of Table 5, exhibited a characteristic in common which distinguished them from their agemates in all the other countries in which the experiment has been conducted. Specifically, the A-P scores for both countries were the lowest in the entire distribution. In other words, both Russia and Israel stood out in the tendency for children to respond in the <u>same</u> way to pressure from peers as to pressure from adults.

How is one to understand this unexpected result? With the benefit of hindsight, we came to the realization that both the Soviet Union and Israel share a common characteristic as societies which distinguishes them from the other countries in our international sample; namely, both exhibit an overriding national concern involving all segments of the population, including both old and young. In the case of the U.S.S.R., an uncompromising and ever-present communist ideology binds children and adults to the same set of political and social beliefs and behavior

patterns (Bronfenbrenner, 1970b). In Israel, a country committed to a differing set of democratic values and a pluralistic system of government, the unifying issue has simply been one of national survival.

This pattern of socio-political similarity, though admittedly post hoc in its derivation, permits a reconciliation of the paradoxical performance of Israeli and Soviet children in the dilemmas experiment. While the sharply contrasting ideologies and social systems in the two countries lead to a marked difference in conformity, with Russian youngsters being much more ready to subscribe to conventional moral values, the fact that in both countries various segments of the society, including old and young, are united in a single overriding national commitment (albeit quite different in each) creates a situation in which social pressure from peers acts in the same direction as social pressure from adults.

In summary, the interpretation of our paradoxical results leads to the formulation of a new hypothesis; namely, the discrepancy between norms for the behavior of children held by adults and by peers is likely to be smallest in those societies which are characterized by an overriding national concern involving all segments of the population. This hypothesis was not anticipated in our study and hence requires cross-validation in further research.

Our third cross-cultural hypothesis also suffered a sharp reversal; contrary to expectations, Israeli children obtained their highest scores under the base condition; that is, they gave their most moral answers when told that no one they knew would see their responses.

Moreover, as can be seen from the middle three columns of Table 5, Israel was the only country in which this pattern occurred. In all other nations, children gave most conventional moral responses when threatened with social exposure to adults.[4]

In seeking an explanation for this anomalous pattern of response, we were led to a consideration of parental expectations and patterns of child rearing in Israel. A dominant theme in Israel, even before the establishment of independence in 1947, has been strong readiness of the early settlers and, to a lesser degree, the present settled population to undergo a personal "change." They held the conviction that some aspects of the Jewish self-concept and patterns of relationships to others had been a product of long centuries of rootlessness and lack of independence in the "Galut" or "Exile" years. Many "Galut" values came to be scorned and despised; a Galut Jew was seen in stereotype as one who acted in fear and self-abnegation, lacking self-confidence and assertiveness. The young Israeli has found it difficult to under-

stand the supposed passivity of many Jews of Europe who were executed by the Nazis. The literature and lore of contemporary Israel glorifies the creation, after centuries of subjugation, of Jewish self-defense organizations, culminating in Hashomer, Haganah, and the present Israel Defense Forces. The history the Israeli lives by today stresses active resistance to oppression, as exemplified by the uprising of the Maccabees, the defense at Masada, and the struggle for independence of the past several decades. In the economic sphere, there occurred an assertive adoption and innovation of new techniques and new social structures, such as the moshav and the kibbutz. New trade union forms and innovative social security policies were evolved. Creative, different, non-conformistic ways of achievement have become the expected and the norm.

The settlers sought to become self-supportive and independent of the good graces of others. Subservience was frowned on, and their children and youth were encouraged to independence, even from the parents (Eisenstadt, 1951, 1967). The ideal was the active, alert, and autonomous child. The parents did not intend to create rebels, but they did welcome signs of independence and self-assertion in their children. Feeling that they themselves were still products of the Galut, they were more or less tolerant of directions the children set, even if they could not always follow or understand.

In recounting the symbols men live by, the concept of the "Sabra" or young Israeli, born not in the Galut but in Israel, serves as a useful example. This native-born Israeli is considered to have the same

characteristics as the fruit of the cactus, the Sabra: hard and prickly outside, soft and sweet inside. Regardless of the correctness of the analogy, it does serve to illustrate the concept held by parents and the self-concept of the children. Israeli youngsters are not especially conformist and their parents seem to enjoy this quality in them, feeling it to be the best equipment they can give to the next generation. The concern for the autonomous child, especially prominent in the kibbutz, has permeated contemporary Israeli culture (Tsur, 1972).

It is suggested that the results of the dilemma experiment in Israel can be understood against this background. Parents do not want their children to be "plastic" or "soap," to use a current Hebrew phrase, and children are not intimidated when told their parents will know what they are doing. On the contrary, we suspect they believe their parents like them to be independent. Evidence in support of this generalization comes from a cross-cultural study currently being conducted by the authors on children's perceptions of the roles of their socializing agents. Israeli parents are described as encouraging autonomy more than their counterparts from the other cultures studied, which include the U.S.A., Great Britain, and Switzerland.

Another possible interpretation of our results is that Israeli children, being told parents will know, adopt a posture of self-assertive, even aggressive, defensiveness. A term current in Israel is that of "davkah," which connotes a kind of negativism. A person when pushed might do just the opposite "just because." This interpretation reflects non-conformism toward parents, while our first ex-

planation implies non-conformism encouraged by parents. These interpretations need not be mutually exclusive.

In another part of our research, Israeli teachers were asked to fill out the dilemma items as they would like their pupils to answer. Their responses were peer-oriented, little different from the children's own answers. In contrast, Soviet teachers had endorsed the conventional moral alternatives. When Israeli children were also asked to state how they felt their teachers would like them to answer, they selected more adult-oriented alternatives. Thus teachers' expectations were actually more peer-oriented than children perceived them to be. This may reflect the ambivalence of adults as well as of children about the role of independence in the young -- independence even from the adults who foster this orientation.

From this point of view, both Soviet and Israeli children are seen to be the products of socialization pressures. The Soviet child learns to conform to moralistic values, but the Israeli child, in no less degree, also learns to conform, paradoxically, in the direction of non-conformity to authority. Peter Kalvin, in a perceptive discussion of socialization and conformity, speaks directly to this phenomenon: "The paradox is this: socialization, in the broadest sense, consists of learning the norms of one's society and coming to conform to them; however, one of these norms and a very fundamental one, is the norm of non-conformity" (1971, P. 217).

Bronfenbrenner (1970b), in contrasting Soviet and American approaches to upbringing, suggested that "the Russians have gone too far in subjecting the child and his peer group to conformity to a single set of values imposed by the adult society" (P. 165). The results for Israel reflect no less involvement of parents in the child's world, but an involvement which reflects peer-oriented values, stressing autonomy from the pressure of adults.

In summary, in their response to social pressure, Israeli and Soviet children appear to differ in a manner that reflects the distinctive fundamental values of each society. In the case of Israel, childhood is thought of as a time of mischief and adventure which prepares the young person for an adult role emphasizing self-confidence and independence; whereas, in the Soviet Union, childhood is a time for learning the discipline and obedience required by communist ideology. Our results indicate, that, in significant measure, both societies are developing in their children characteristics that each values most.

Turning next to our hypotheses on the effects of collective upbringing, we must first take note of a negative conclusion. The expectation that children raised on the kibbutz would exhibit a pattern of response similar to that observed in products of Soviet group upbringing is clearly unsupported. In their reaction to social pressure, kibbutz children were far more similar to their compatriots raised in conventional families than to Russian youngsters, whether attending boarding schools or day schools. Yet, the contrast between familial and collective upbringing showed some continuity across the two

societies, especially for girls. The tendency observed in the U.S.S.R. for collectively raised children to conform more to conventional values was also evidenced in the Israeli kibbutz, but for females only. In both countries, the tendency to give more moral responses under threat of social exposure was greater for children raised in collective settings than for those brought up at home, but, this trend was stronger for girls than for boys. Looking at these same findings from the view point of sex differences, in both societies the tendency for girls to exceed boys in conformity was found only among children raised in collective settings and, in these settings, tended to increase under threat of social exposure.

From one perspective, the foregoing findings lend support to our general hypothesis that the effects of social pressure will be greater for children brought up primarily in a single socialization setting, in this case a collective, than for children raised in two contexts simultaneously; i.e., family and school. For what our results tell us is that cultural differences, sex differences, and effects of threatened social exposure were all greater for children raised in collective settings than for youngsters brought up at home. But these same results, looked at another way, indicate that the effects of family vs. collective upbringing vary by culture and sex of child; specifically, the impact of the setting contrast was more powerful in the Soviet Union than in Israel and greater for girls than for boys. Why should this be the case?

Addressing first the qualifying factor of culture, we begin by noting that the Israeli kibbutz and the Soviet boarding school, while both involving the children's collective as the primary setting of upbringing, differ significantly in the extent to which the family also plays a significant role. Thus children in Russian boarding schools visit their parents, or vice versa, only once a fortnight, whereas in the kibbutz, youngsters see their families for extended periods every day and engage in extensive interactions with them. The effect of all this contact is reflected in patterns of parent-child interaction. In a companion study (Devereux, et al., 1974), the subjects of the present research were asked to describe the frequency of various parent behaviors in the spheres of both affection and discipline. Out of twelve variables, eight showed no difference for families of kibbutz- vs. city-reared children. Both groups saw their parents as equally supportive, although city families were perceived as exercising greater discipline.

In sum, it is clear that, in terms of family involvement, the Israeli kibbutz is a less pure example of collective upbringing than the Soviet boarding school. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the impact of family vs. collective upbringing on children's reactions to social pressure was greater in the Soviet than in the Israeli sample.

The tendency for mode of upbringing (family vs. collective) to have a greater impact on girls than on boys does not invite as ready or reliable an explanation. To be sure, there is evidence from experiments on social compliance (Asch, 1956; Kilham & Mann, 1973; Sheridan & King, 1972) that female subjects are more likely to conform than

males, and Bronfenbrenner (1961b) and others (Mischel, 1970) have documented differences in socialization practices toward boys and girls consistent with the development of greater social dependency in the female. For example, in our earlier study of kibbutz child rearing patterns (Devereux, et al., 1974) it was shown that kibbutz boys were exposed to the influences of both father and mother somewhat more than kibbutz girls; hence, for boys, the kibbutz socialization setting may be more pluralistic. But in the absence of direct evidence relating child rearing antecedents to response in the dilemmas experiment, any conclusion must remain purely speculative.

In conclusion, our attempt to examine experimentally the effects of social pressure on children from two societies, Israel and the U.S.S.R., with widely contrasting systems of child rearing both between and within the two cultures, has lent support to several of our original hypotheses, but also generated new ones. In the first category, the markedly greater conformity of Soviet youngsters is consistent with the general proposition that the less pluralistic the political structure of a society, the more likely are its children to subscribe to conventional moral values. An unexpected finding of similarity of reaction to pressure from peers vs. adults on the part of Israeli youngsters led to the formulation of a new hypothesis that discrepancy between norms for behavior held by children and adults is likely to be smallest in those societies which are characterized by an overriding national concern involving all segments of the population. A comparison in both countries of children reared in family vs. collective settings yielded results

generally consistent with our thesis that youngsters brought up primarily in a single socialization setting are more susceptible to social pressures than children reared in multiple contexts within and outside the family. The fact that the impact of collective vs. family influence was greater in Russian than in Israeli society was traced to the relatively greater involvement of parents in the lives of kibbutz children as compared with Soviet boarding school pupils. Probably in part for this same reason, kibbutz children, contrary to the stated hypotheses, did not exhibit a pattern of response similar to that found previously for products of Soviet collective upbringing. Rather, they behaved like their home-reared Israeli compatriots in showing a unique reaction to social pressure; unlike children from every other nation in which the dilemmas experiment has been carried out to date, they gave their most moral responses under the base condition, when neither their parents nor their friends would know of their answers. This result is interpreted as reflecting the emphasis placed in Israeli society and socialization on the development of moral autonomy and independence of action on the part of children and youth, an orientation that contrasts dramatically with the values and methods of upbringing in the U.S.S.R. Thus both societies emerge as successfully inculcating in their children the distinctive qualities that each highly prize.

References

Asch, S. E. Studies of independence and conformity. Psychological Monographs, 1956, 70,(9, Whole No. 416).

Bronfenbrenner, U. Toward a theoretical model for the analysis of parent-child relationships in a social context. In J. D. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes and child behavior. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1961. Pp. 90-109. (a)

Bronfenbrenner, U. The changing American child. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1961, 7, 73-84. (b)

Bronfenbrenner, U. Soviet methods of character education. American Psychologist, 1962, 17, 550-564.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Response to pressure from peers versus adults among Soviet and American school children. International Journal of Psychology, 1967, 2, 199-207.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Reaction to social pressure from adults versus peers among Soviet day school and boarding school pupils in the perspective of an American sample. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 179-189. (a)

Bronfenbrenner, U. Two worlds of childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970. (b)

Devereux, E. C., Shouval, R., Bronfenbrenner, U., Rodgers, R. R., Kav Venaki, S., Kiely, E., & Karson, E. Socialization practices of parents, teachers and peers in Israel: The kibbutz versus the city. Child Development, 1974, 45, 269-281.

Eisenstadt, S. N. Youth, culture and social structure in Israel. British Journal of Sociology, 1951, 2, 105-114.

Eisenstadt, S. N. Israeli society. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

Garbarino, J. & Bronfenbrenner, U. The socialization of moral judgment and behavior in cross-cultural perspective. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Morality: A handbook of moral development and behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975, in press.

Kelvin, P. Socialization and conformity. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 1971, 12, 211-222.

Kilham, W. & Mann, L. Level of distructive obedience as a function of transmittor and executant roles in the Milgram Obedience Paradigm. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973,

Makarenko, A. S. O Kommunisticheskom Vospitanii (On communist upbringing). Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Uchebno-pedagogicheskoye Izdatel'stvo, 1952.

Makarenko, A. S. The road to life. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1955.

Mischel, W. Sex typing and socialization. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology. (3rd ed.) New York: John Wiley, 1970. Pp. 73-158.

Sheridan, C. L. & King, R. G. Obedience to authority with an authentic victim. Proceedings, 80th Annual Convention, American Psychological Association, 1972.

Tsur, M. What is kibbutz? Federation of Kibbutzim in Israel, 1972.

Vincent, J. Scaling the universe of states on certain useful multivariate dimensions. Journal of Social Psychology, 1971, 85, 261-283.

Footnotes

[1]This investigation is part of a long term research program on Cross Cultural Studies of Socialization being conducted in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies at the New York State College of Human Ecology at Cornell University with Urie Bronfenbrenner as the Principal Investigator. The Soviet phase of this research was supported by grants from the National Science Foundation and the Russell Sage Foundation; the Israeli phase by the National Science Foundation and the U. S. Office of Education. Permission to carry out research procedures in Israeli schools and kibbutzim was granted by the Israeli Ministry of Education and by the Institute for Research on Kibbutz Education at Oranim. Special thanks are extended to Dr. Menachem Gerson and to Michael Nathan of the Oranim Institute for their assistance.

[2]The experiment was designed by Urie Bronfenbrenner in collaboration with E. C. Devereux, G. F. Suci, and R. R. Rodgers. For more detailed accounts, see Bronfenbrenner, 1967, 1970.

[3]The authors are indebted to the following colleagues who conducted the experiments in their respective lands: Hungary, Dr. Sandor Komlosi, Tanárképző Főiskola; Czechoslovakia and West Germany, Dr. Franz Banhegyi, Institute of Psychology, Bratislava and University of Cologne; Poland, Dr. Edda Fleszner owa, Universytet Warszawski; Japan, Dr. Kazuo Aoi, Tokyo University; Canada, Dr. James Jenks, University of Alberta, Professor Geoffrey Mason, University of Victoria; Holland, Dr. Meindert Slagter, der Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen; Scotland, Halla Beloff, University of Edinburgh; Switzerland, Dr. Kurt Lüscher, University of Bern.

[4]One other exception has come to our attention. In five replications of the dilemmas experiment with Canadian samples, one carried out by Geoffrey Mason in Victoria, British Columbia, also produced lowest scores under the base condition. Since we are not families with the cultural background of the children, we are not in a position to offer any interpretation comparable to that given for the Israeli case.

TABLE 1

Average Response to Social Pressure

Under the Three Experimental Conditions

(High score indicates adherence to conventional moral standards.)

	Base	Adult	Peer	Total Score (Mean)
Israel				
Family				
Girls	2.54	1.04	0.44	1.34
Boys	3.00	1.39	0.60	1.66
Both sexes	2.77	1.22	0.52	1.50
Collective				
Girls	2.58	2.75	1.65	2.33
Boys	1.53	0.85	-0.41	0.79
Both sexes	2.26	1.80	0.62	1.56
U.S.S.R.				
Family				
Girls	12.36	12.89	13.26	12.84
Boys	11.25	12.08	11.38	11.57
Both sexes	11.81	12.49	12.32	12.20
Collective				
Girls	15.11	17.02	16.90	16.34
Boys	12.54	14.21	13.18	13.31
Both sexes	13.82	15.62	15.04	14.83

TABLE 2

Means and Mean Differences on Overall Conformity to Conventional Moral Values (Total Score) by Culture and Upbringing Setting

(A higher score indicates higher conformity.)

	I	II	III	IV
	Israel	U.S.S.R.	Israel plus U.S.S.R. (Mean)	Israel minus U.S.S.R.
Family	1.50	12.20	6.85	-10.70**
Collective	1.56	14.83	8.20	-13.27**
Family plus Collective (Mean)	1.53	13.52	7.53	-11.99**[a]
Family minus Collective	-0.06n.s.	-2.63*	-1.35*[b]	2.57*[c]

[a]Column effect: difference between cultures.

[b]Row effect: family vs. collective setting

[c]Interaction effect: culture times setting

*$p < .05$.

**$p < .01$.

TABLE 3

Mean Differences in Adult Minus Peer Conformity Score by Culture and Upbringing Setting

	I Israel	II U.S.S.R.	III Israel plus U.S.S.R. (Mean)	IV Israel minus U.S.S.R.
Family	0.70n.s.	0.17n.s.	0.43n.s.	0.53n.s.
Collective	1.18n.s.	0.58n.s.	0.88n.s.	0.60n.s.
Family plus Collective (Mean)	0.94n.s.	0.37n.s.	0.65n.s.	0.57n.s.[a]
Family minus Collective	-0.48n.s.	-0.41n.s.	-0.45n.s.[b]	0.07n.s.[c]

[a] Column effect: difference between cultures

[b] Row effect: family vs. collective setting

[c] Interaction effect: culture times setting

TABLE 4

Mean Differences in Experimental Minus Base Conformity Score by Culture and Upbringing Setting

	I Israel	II U.S.S.R.	III Israel plus U.S.S.R. (Mean)	IV Israel minus U.S.S.R.
Family	-1.90*	0.60n.s.	-0.65n.s.	-2.50*
Collective	-1.05n.s.	1.51*	0.23n.s.	-2.56*
Family plus Collective (Mean)	-1.48*	1.06*	-0.21n.s.	-2.54**[a]
Family minus Collective	-0.85n.s.	-0.91n.s.	-0.88*[b]	0.06n.s.[c]

[a]Column effect: difference between cultures

[b]Row effect: family vs. collective setting

[c]Interaction effect: culture times setting

*$p < .05$.

**$p < .01$.

TABLE 5

Dilemmas Experiment: Means for Experimental Conditions in Various Cultures

	I	II	III	IV	V
	Total Score	Base	Adult	Peer	A-P
U.S.S.R.					
Boarding	14.83	13.82	15.62	15.04	0.58
Day	12.20	11.81	12.49	12.32	0.17
Hungary	14.06	13.28	15.17	13.74	1.43
Czechoslovakia	9.46	10.36	10.38	7.64	2.74*
Poland	6.14	6.94	7.60	3.90	3.70**
Japan[a]	3.76	3.77	4.62	2.90	1.72*
Canada[b]	2.92	3.58	4.27	0.91	3.36**
West Germany	2.83	1.79	4.43	2.26	2.17*
U.S.A.	2.22	2.43	2.96	1.27	1.69*
Israel					
Kibbutz	1.56	2.26	1.80	0.62	1.18
City	1.50	2.77	1.42	0.52	0.70
Holland	1.18	1.27	2.10	0.16	1.94
Scotland	0.40	1.31	1.77	-1.89	3.66**
Switzerland	-2.09	-1.59	-0.76	-3.91	3.15**

[a]Based on two experiments.

[b]Based on five experiments.

*$p < .05$.

**$p < .01$.

APPENDIX E

"The Socialization of Moral Judgment and Behavior in Cross-Cultural Perspective"

James Garbarino and Urie Bronfenbrenner

The Socialization of Moral Judgement and Behavior in Cross-Cultural Perspective

James Garbarino Urie Bronfenbrenner

Department of Human Development and Family Studies

Cornell University

I. INTRODUCTION

II. A MODEL OF MORAL SOCIALIZATION

III. CULTURAL FACTORS INFLUENCING MORAL SOCIALIZATION

IV. HISTORICAL INSTANCES OF THE MORAL SOCIALIZATION MODEL

V. AN EMPIRICAL ILLUSTRATION

The Socialization of Moral Judgment and Behavior in Cross-Cultural Perspective

James Garbarino Urie Bronfenbrenner
Department of Human Development and Family Studies
Cornell University

I. INTRODUCTION

II. A MODEL OF MORAL SOCIALIZATION

III. CULTURAL FACTORS INFLUENCING MORAL SOCIALIZATION

IV. HISTORICAL INSTANCES OF THE MORAL SOCIALIZATION MODEL

V. AN EMPIRICAL ILLUSTRATION

I. Introduction

Cultural variations in moral judgment and behavior have posed a knotty theoretical problem for the student of human development. Cross-cultural studies of morality have commonly remarked on the complexity and diversity of values to be found across time and space (Robertson, 1947; Sidgwick, 1960, Ferguson, 1958). One commentator has been led to conclude that

> There is scarcely one norm or standard of good conduct that, in another time and place, does not serve to mark bad conduct.
> (Melden, 1967, p. 7)

One possible exception to this conclusion is the universality of the incest taboo (Murdock, 1949), although even here we find variation in the scope and applicability of the moral prohibition. In general, however, it appears that the substance of morality -- i.e. the actual values and principles of ethical conduct, or rules and of mores -- is deeply imbedded in specific cultural patterns (Benedict, 1934).

When, however, we view cross-cultural differences in the abstract principles of morality — e.g. justice — a more coherent pattern appears to emerge. Anthropologists are quick to point to the structural function of values and the merits of a relativistic approach to morality. In this view the most sophisticated and most primitive cultures share common attention to basic human needs. As a result

values are analyzed in terms of their functional validity, and in such terms are seen to be equivalent despite gross differences in specific content (Goodman, 1967).

Some commentators have suggested an historical approach to morality in which a pattern of evolutionary development is observed. This pattern is seen as the development of ever wider and more generalizable concerns with an ever expanding range of social settings. The result of this development is thought to be ever more abstract and comprehensive moral principles and values (Myers, 1913). This historical development is reflected in contemporary interest in hierarchies and types in the study of morality. Modern theorists of a psycho-social bent have been predominantly of two orientations -- the cognitive developmental stage approach and the non-hierarchical type approach.

The cognitively oriented "stage" theorists of Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1969) have added an important dimension of coherence to the study of moral development but are not readily amenable to the study of cultural variation given their emphasis on essentially acultural invariant sequences. This logical problem is compounded by cross-cultural empirical findings which are inconsistent with predictions based on the stage theory. Although close correspondence with Piaget's model has been observed in studies of children from continental Europe (Lerner, 1947; Caruso, 1943; Ponzo, 1956), the further one moves away from the European mainland

in distance and culture, the more frequently are departures from or outright contradictions with the Piagetian model. Harrower (1935) reported cross-cultural differences in the rate at which stages develop in children. Boehm (1957), Dennis (1943), Havighurst and Neugarten (1955), Liu (1950), Mac Rae (1954), Medinnus (1959), Morris (1958), and Durkin (1959a, 1959b, 1959c) all provide evidence in some way contradicting Piaget's model of moral development as for the most part an invariant maturational sequence. Furthermore, several investigators reported findings of social class differences in the rate and pattern of moral development (e.g. Harrower, 1935; Lerner, 1937; Aronfreed, 1961). Kohlberg's cognitively oriented model -- in many ways an advanced conception when compared with Piaget's -- focuses on a similar essentially invariant sequence of stages, but a sequence which is based on commonalities of socialization experiences and cognitive development. It is with this form of the cognitive stage theory that we shall be concerned.

In contrast to the cognitively oriented stage theories, we may consider approaches employing a non-hierarchical "typology" (Bronfenbrenner, 1962). While such approaches are amenable to the problem of cross-cultural variation, they have not been able to deal adequately with observed moral hierarchies -- both in developmental and cognitive terms. It is also the case that operational mechanisms relating sociocultural factors to individual socialization

patterns have not been forthcoming.

The purpose of this essay is to attempt to resolve these inconsistencies in the study of cultural variations in moral judgment and behavior. In pursuit of this resolution we propose first a model of moral development which accommodates both the "stage" and "type" oriented approaches. Secondly, we advance a model of socialization capable of handling our view of moral development. The essay then relates our socialization and moral development models to a cross-cultural perspective, using historical cases to illustrate the relation of large-scale social events and organization to individual social and personality development -- particularly moral development. Finally, in order to provide a preliminary empirical test of our hypothesis we propose an operational mechanism at the sociocultural level to account for cultural differences in moral judgment and behavior.

II. A Model of Moral Socialization

The impetus to organize morality in terms of structural schema has been a strong one. It is present in nearly all considerations of moral judgment and behavior, be they by philosophers or psychologists. We have pointed out that two major emphases in modern psychological approaches to moral development have been the "stage" and "type" analyses represented by Kohlberg (1969) and Bronfenbrenner (1962), respectively. Kohlberg's theory postulates hierarchical

developmental stages of moral reasoning which are held to be inextricably tied to cognitive development, invariant in order and generated by the interplay of maturation and general environmental experience. Kohlberg defines six stages in the development of morality: 'punishment and obedience orientation," "instrumental relativist orientation," "interpersonal concordance or 'good boy-nice girl' orientation," "law and order orientation," "social-contract legalistic orientation," and "universal ethical principle orientation." (Kohlberg, 1972).

In contrast to Kohlberg's stage approach, Bronfenbrenner's analysis (1962) describes five types of moral judgment and behavior. These types include: 1) "Self-Oriented" in which the individual is motivated primarily by impulses of self-gratification without regard for the desires or expectations of others -- except as objects of manipulation; 2) "Authority-Oriented" in which the individual accepts parental strictures and values as immutable and generalizes this orientation to include moral standards imposed by other adults and authority figures; 3) "Peer-Oriented" in which the individual is an adaptive conformist who goes along with the peer group -- which is largely autonomous of adult authority and ultimately of all social authority, and in which behavior is guided by momentary shifts in group opinion and interest; 4) "Collective-Oriented" in which the individual is committed to a set of enduring group goals

which take precedence over individual desires, obligations and interpersonal relationships; 5) "Objectively-Oriented" in which the individual's values are functionally autonomous -- i.e. they have arisen through social interaction but are no longer dependent, on a day to day basis, upon social agents for their meaning and application -- and in which the individual responds to situations on the basis of principles rather than on the basis of orientations toward social agents. This social-psychological scheme, however, lacks a developmental dimension. The process through which a person or a group arrives at one or another orientation is not specified and remains unclear. Nor is it clear whether one type emerges from another, or whether there is a typical sequence of types in development.

This paper attempts a reconciliation of the two major models -- the "stage" and "type" approaches -- through a formulation which incorporates both developmental and social components. Thus, our view complements the Kohlberg approach in that while his view emphasizes the common features of social environments and institutions across and within cultures, our view focuses on the differences. It represents an attempt to place the earlier analysis by Bronfenbrenner in a model which includes a logical and developmental hierarchy. In short, we propose a <u>socialization</u> model for moral development. Like the Piagetian-Kohlberg model, this formulation envisages a series of hierarchical stages but views

the hierarchy not as the product of universally immanent motivational forces but as an interaction between maturing capacities and motivations of the child, on the one hand, and particular characteristics of his sociocultural milieu, on the other.

In general, we envision three developmental stages, the order of which would be the same for all persons and cultures. At the "bottom" is an essentially amoral pattern in which some sort of primary hedonic orientation is the organizing principle. This is clearly an ethic of self-interest, of pleasure-pain dichotomies, of manipulation and instrumentalities governed by no end other than self-satisfaction. In terms of the two approaches considered above, this level roughly corresponds to Kohlberg's Stage 0 and to Bronfenbrenner's self-oriented type. In conventional terms, such an individual is "unsocialized;" he is in a sense outside the human community normatively, behaviorally and psychologically. This level may be thought of as developmentally "normal" only in the earliest period of infancy. As we shall see below, the first development of attachment to social agents brings about a Level 2 form of moral behavior. For Level 1, "premoral" behavior to occur in an older child or adult is in principle pathological, both for the individual and his society. Below we consider instances of such pathogenic conditions.

The second level is constituted by patterns of morality having as their dominant characteristic allegiance and

orientation to some system of social agents. This is a level in which the individual's moral judgment and behavior are given direction by some individuals or groups that are salient for his affective and social needs. If we are to think in terms of Kohlberg's stages, Level 2 corresponds roughly to stages 1-5. In Bronfenbrenner's type analysis, Level 2 includes the authority-orientation, peer-orientation, and collective orientation.

Within Level 2 we see the following relations among the various types. First there may be one hierarchical, sequential "path" of moral development along which persons proceed. In such a case it is appropriate to assess the relative position of individuals in the hierarchy of "stages." In our view, this is what the developmental stage view presented and researched by Kohlberg does in the context of Western society. Second, there may be alternative "paths" of moral development within and across cultures. For example there may be an individualistic and a collective sequence which coexist in a single social order. A third possibility is that there are multiple orientations possible which are not arranged as a single hierarchy. Thus, an individual may -- for reasons of group or family idiosyncracy -- develop a "simple" authority, collective or peer oriented morality directly from Level 1. Within the same social system other individuals may be developing a series of orientations; first authority, then collective, or first

authority, then peer. In any case, it should be stressed that, in principle, the combinations are as numerous as the social orders which can be observed cross-culturally or hypothesized to exist. For example, Western societies may be in the process of evolving new forms which may lead to new moral socialization patterns. On the other hand, the socialization patterns of the "New China" may give rise to new progressions of moral orientation. Formats for moral development, in our view, are as malleable as overall human development.

Of particular importance cross-culturally is the distribution of different kinds of moral patterns within a society, as well as the modal type. This is the case because such a description may be thought of as providing an assessment of the salient structure and ideology of the social system. By examining the paths of moral development within a particular culture, an index of the social system is obtained. By further noting the relative frequency with which primary and secondary paths are "travelled" by a person within that culture -- as a function of sex, socioeconomic status, age, ethnic affiliation, etc. -- we may obtain a relatively complete picture of the culture's moral system and at the same time gain important insights into its overall strategy of socialization.

The third level is a pattern which is "highest" both logically and developmentally. At this level, values,

principles, and ideas rather than social agents are the directing forces. The individual applies standards of ethical conduct in a primarily intellective fashion, largely independently of psycho-social factors. In Kohlberg's terms, this is the morality of principles, of contract and conscience. In Bronfenbrenner's type approach, this is the "objective-orientation." The critical question becomes one of determining the cultural conditions conducive to movement from the first to the second and from the second to the third levels. Each upward movement, however, presents different psycho-social questions. That is, whereas Level 2 forms of morality can be expected to develop in almost everyone barring massive disruption of socialization processes -- attainment of Level 3 morality is thought to occur only under a relatively restricted set of social conditions. Specifically, attainment of Level 3 morality requires a setting in which an individual is provided opportunities, security, and social support for the development of abstract thinking and speculation as a product of partially competing and overlapping social allegiances. That is, there must be relative freedom and security to develop intellectually resolution of a conflict in a setting in which there are competing social loyalties dissonant enough to promote a measure of tension but not so uncompatible as to be overwhelming. We shall deal in more detail with these conditions below. At this point, let it suffice to say that such a

configuration of social conditions does not occur in every culture, either at the group or individual level and hence is not a "given" either of social systems in general or of the conditions of life for particular persons.

III. Cultural Factors Influencing Moral Socialization

We turn next to a consideration of the cultural factors affecting socialization with an eye to assessing cultural variations in moral development as defined by the three-level moral hierarchy described above.

Our model suggests the following questions. What are the socialization contingencies involved in bringing about developmental movement from Level 1 to Level 2? What socialization factors determine which type or types of moral orientation occur within the second level? What patterns of socialization lead to development of Level 3? Under what conditions, if any, does "regression" from a higher to a lower level occur?

In our view, developmental movement from Level 1 to Level 2 is based on and stimulated by attachment, the primary socialization of the organism to "belong" to and with social agents. This is the process by which the individual organism becomes an acculturated person. Without this development of affective and cognitive orientation to other people, the motivation to incorporate a system of morality defined and directed by social agents may well not arise. This view is supported

by research indicating that patterns of interaction and responsiveness during early infancy are associated with early obedience to adult prohibitions (Stayton, Hogan and Ainsworth, 1971). Furthermore, studies of the long-term consequences of early social neglect indicate a pattern of psychopathology which may be characterized as amoral (Bowlby, 1948). Ordinarily this development is directed toward the parents at the outset, but comes to be oriented toward other social agents as a function of the patterns of social interaction which obtain in early and middle childhood. This process of social "redirection" leads us to an answer to our second question: what determines the particular type of moral orientation within Level 2?

After the task of primary socialization has been accomplished, the child, in most settings, first develops an "adult" or "authority" oriented morality. It would seem that the patterns of child care surrounding the infant would determine whether some other orientation arises. For example, Freud and Dann (1951) report a case in which a small group of children developed a peer orientation in earliest childhood as a result of being without the care of adults on a regular and enduring basis. These children, growing up in Nazi concentration camps without permanent parents, apparently did not develop an "adult" orientation while the peer arrangement persisted. It was not until after the children were put into a setting of strong adult presence and influence -- as a

rehabilitative measure after liberation from the concentration camps -- that they in fact did so. It may also be noted that Soviet child care arrangements result in a very early collective orientation (Bronfenbrenner, 1970), but were built upon and existing concurrently with strong maternal attachment.

The specific nature of the child's moral orientation within Level 2, however, can change. The adult orientation is "first" in the sense that in most cultural settings -- as a result of the patterns of child care implied by the "universality" of the family (Murdock, 1949) -- attachment to specific adults is the initial form of social orientation. This orientation is, however, specific to the caregiving adults and it remains an open question whether the child's allegiance will be generalized to a comprehensive adult orientation or to some other form. In settings in which the adults continue to exert a dominant role in the social life of the child, it may be expected that the "authority" orientation will endure and develop. This is development in the sense that it represents a systematic extension of allegiance from the caregiving adults to adults in general, and from adults in general to institutions and figures of authority in general. In such a progression, Kohlberg's description of successive stages may prove useful to represent cognitively more sophisticated features of this expanding allegiance to authority (Kohlberg, 1969).

APPENDIX E

In settings in which the adults abrogate their interactive and directive role, peers may be expected to "fill the vacuum," and "peer orientation" arises. In settings in which adults "transfer" their authority to groups organized around socially-sanctioned values and goals, it may be expected that the "collective" orientation will dominate. In each case, it should be noted, the motivational basis of the orientation is the primary socialization, the involvement with the human community founded on the strength of the attachment in infancy. The crucial events, then, center around the direction in which that primary attachment is turned by the culturally determined patterns of childhood socialization.

Development of the third level -- orientation to principle rather than to control by social agents -- is predicated upon a social structure characterized by multiple social agents to whom the child is attached and who are "pulling" him in somewhat different directions. The consequences of intense contradictions have generally been thought to be pathological. Bateson (1972), for example, has termed such a situation a "double bind" in which the individual is "damned if he does and damned if he doesn't." In Bateson's view such double binds -- if they are persistent characteristics of the individual's environment -- lead to schizophrenia. In our view, however, when the contradictions are moderate, the consequences enhance the development of moral judgment. In such circumstances, the individual cannot merely conform. Rather, he

must decide, reconcile oppositions, and overcome contradictions; in short, make independent judgments. For such a resolution to occur, the conflict must be cognitively and affectively manageable. This requires that in addition to a situation of supporting but differentiated agents in the "near" environment of the family and peer group, the social structure itself must be integrated. In other words, it is important that the competing social forces nevertheless involve a common commitment to the social and political order, some stake in "the public peace." Almond and Verba (1963) have discussed such a setting of socio-political "diversity within consensus" and the politically disintegrative consequences of too much diversity and insufficient consensus. These consequences, in Almond and Verba's analysis, include apathy, alienation and absolutism.

When the delicate balance of diversity and consensus is attained the individual may be expected to develop an orientation to principles -- to abstract values no longer tied to particular social agents -- which he can then apply to concrete situations. By contrast, for the person operating at Level 2, orientation to the social agent is paramount. The kind of social structure capable of generating a Level 3 morality is a balance of competing forces. Neither monlithic nor anomic, it is best characterized as pluralistic.

By pluralistic we mean a setting in which there are social agents and entities which represent somewhat different

expectations, sanctions, and rewards for members of the society. These differences generate inter-group conflict that is largely regulated by a set of "ground rules" (e.g. a constitution) and common commitment to integrative principles or goals (such as a religious ethic). A monolithic setting, in contrast, is one in which all social agents and entities are organized around an identity of goals or principles. Conversely, an anomic setting is one in which there is almost no integration; social agents and entities are either absent or represent a multiplicity of divergent forces having no normative or institutional coherence.

Pluralism would apply to various aspects of the socialization process, both within the family -- e.g. two parents vs. one, extended family vs. nuclear -- and to relations between the family and other socializing systems such as peer group, school neighborhood, community, world of work, civic and political organizations, etc. Such pluralism might be expected to vary within cultures as a function of social class -- i.e. as socioeconomic factors affected the opportunities for exposure to multiple allegiances, to diverse cultural experiences, to education which exposes one to different points of view, etc.

Evidence consistent with this formulation comes from several sources. First, Bronfenbrenner and his associates (1961; 1970) have found that families in which the parents have strong but undifferentiated identities and family roles

tend to have children who rate highest on such dimensions as responsibility, autonomy, independence of judgment, interpersonal adjustment, etc. (as measured by teacher ratings). Children from families in which one parent dominates or in which neither parent exerts a strong influence are characterized by relatively low ratings on the same dimensions.

Similarly, Bronfenbrenner (1970) found differences between Soviet adolescents exposed to a single socialization setting (boarding school students) and those exposed to multiple settings (day school students) in the degree to which their moral judgments oriented toward adult authority. The students exposed to the monolithic social setting expressed more authority-oriented moral judgements than those exposed to the pluralistic setting. Thus, the moral judgments of the students living at home were not oriented toward a single focus but instead forced to find a balance between competing social agents and agencies -- in this case peers vs. adults.

Studies by Baumrind (1967; 1967b; 1971) provide a second source of evidence for the pluralistic hypothesis. Baumrind's work has revealed a pattern among families with young children which she designates as "Authoritative". This pattern stands in contradiction to the "Permissive" on the one hand, and the "Authoritarian" on the other. Each of these two latter types is characterized by the dominance of one participant in the child-parent relationship. In the Permissive case it is the child who is dominant, whereas in the Authoritarian it is the

parent. In the Authoritative case, however, there is a reciprocal, interactive relationship in which forces exerted by the parent and the child are in a state of creative tension. From our theoretical perspective, Baumrind's Authoritarian and Permissive patterns correspond to the monolithic and anomic orientations. Baumrind's finding that the Authoritative pattern is associated with the highest levels of competence, responsibility and other developmentally important characteristics (assessed observationally and through teacher reports) is consistent with our hypothesized relation between pluralism and moral development.

An additional, and somewhat indirect, source of support for the pluralistic model comes from the theories of Hunt (1965) and White (1959; 1963) and from the empirical findings of Kagan (1971) which suggest that an intrinsic "incongruity mechanism" is the directing motivational factor in much of human development. This incongruity mechanism is held to thrive on "optimal discrepancy." According to Kagan, informational inputs which are either so undifferentiated as to be "boring" or so highly differentiated as to be "confusing and indistinguishable" do not activate the motivational and exploratory cognitive processes associated with the "incongruity mechanism." The optimal input pattern is one which is moderately complex and differentiated, which can be matched with an internal standard to assess its incongruity with established schema. Data in support of this theoretical orientation are

reported by Kagan (1971). Hunt (1965) goes so far as to propose a relation between this incongruity mechanism and the classical conceptions of human rationality provided by Aristotle, St. Thomas Acquinas, and Locke. He further suggests a relationship between the incongruity mechanism and rationality, on the one hand, and theories of political pluralism, on the other. This implies that a pluralistic setting corresponds to a state of "optimal discrepancy" and is cognitively enhancing, unlike the non-stimulating monolithic setting and the confusing anomic setting. Furthermore, given the functional relationship between cognitive development and social-moral development (e.g. Lee, 1971; Kohlberg, 1967), it seems plausible that the pluralistic setting would result in the highest level of moral development. As Hunt suggests, one can postulate that human rationality inheres in the incongruity mechanism and that the development of such an inherent rationality, particularly as represented in morality, is facilitated by pluralistic settings.

Turning to the question of regression from higher to lower levels, a shift from Level 2 to Level 1 might be expected to occur when primary agents of socialization are removed or cease to function so that there is no one who offers the individual either resistance or support. Regression from Level 3 to Level 2 would be expected to occur coincidently with a collapse of the pluralistic pattern -- either through a disintegration of the social commitment holding together the

competing elements of system, or a totalistic integration of the separate elements into a monolithic entity.

It should be noted that, in our view, the individual operating at Level 3 can continue to function despite the breakdown of the supporting conditions, at least for a period of time. This affords a measure of stability to the moral socialization system, a kind of positive cultural "lag." The critical point to be made is that if the supporting pluralism deteriorates the long term result will be a reduction in Level 3 throughout the social system. A case in point is provided by Bettelheim's description (1943) of the moral breakdown of prisoners in concentration camps and their adoption of their jailers' attitudes, action, and attire.

In summary, the accomplishment of primary socialization requires a setting in which sustained interaction between child and parent can establish the primary attachment necessary for socially orientented motivation. This initial motivation is then expanded through social interaction with others to become a comprehensive orientation toward a specific social agent -- Level 2. This in turn can lead to a series of multiple social allegiances which require the individual to develop an autonomous set of principles as guides for action. If the pattern of multiple competing allegiances occurs, development of an "objective" orientation can result. Maintenance of this Level 3 morality for the society as a whole depends on the degree to which a condition of pluralism is

maintained -- as opposed to either a monolithic-totalitarian or anomic-chaotic context.

Table 1 provides a schematic description of a socialization system capable of generating Level 3 moral development as a general phenomenon. The Table shows the moral socialization outcomes and critical variables at each stage of the life cycle. Thus it describes the circumstances leading to development of Level 2 to Level 1 (during infancy and early childhood) and the subsequent attainment of Level 3 (in later childhood, adolescence and adulthood). Moreover, the Table indicates that pluralism -- implying involvement in varied and increasingly complex social interactions and settings -- is critically important for social-moral development throughout the developmental range, not just for advancing from Level 2 to Level 3.

IV. Historical Instances of the Moral Socialization Model

To illustrate the workings of the socialization model described above, we next turn our attention to several historical examples at the cultural and social structural levels. These examples are intended to illustrate the following aspects of the model.

1. Socio-cultural breakdown can result in massive instances of behavior at Level 1 of our morality hierarchy, both through non-socialization of young children and through regression from Level 2 to Level 1.

2. Human intervention can result in a "recovery" of individuals who have regressed to Level 1 or a less desirable orientation within Level 2. By restructuring the socialization environment of the individual, the orientation towards social agents can be both created and altered.

3. Disrupting the institutional pluralism of a social system will result in an alteration of developmental sequences and distribution of individuals among the types within Level 2. Such redirection of the society's institutional life along totalitarian lines can be accomplished in a relatively short time. Resistance to such redirection is strong in individuals and groups as a function of their commitment to alternative social allegiances.

[Insert Table 1 here]

Historically, there have been circumstances of social disruption so extreme that the natural processes of socialization, the "ties that bind," broke down. Such a breakdown occurred, for example, in the period of social upheaval and civil strife which filled the decade from 1919-1929 in the Soviet Union. There appeared a large number of unattached and uncared for children and adolescents. The children, referred to as "bezprizorniye" (literally, "without looking after") were abandoned and homeless victims of the social chaos. Their numbers — reaching, according to some estimates, as high as nine million in 1922 (Geiger, 1968) -- reflected

TABLE 1: A MODEL FOR STUDYING THE RELATIONSHIP OF SOCIOPYSHCOLOGICAL PLURALISM TO MORAL DEVELOPMENT

Developmental Level	Moral Socialization Outcome	Critical Pluralistic Variables
Infancy	Establishment of attachment -- i.e. primary socialization	Caregiving patterns -- both behavio: normative -- contributing to progre: ively more complex systems of recip: infant—adult interaction Structure of child-other interactio:
Early Childhood	Expansion of primary attachment relationships into ever-widening circles	Progressive expansion of patterns of association from primary caretiv infant dyads to larger social syste consistent with the "optimal dis- crepancy model" Initial pluralistic social setting: with several different persons serv as objects for the child's attentio and affiliation and as sources of demands Initial ability to respond to differential influences through "ob cognitive response orientation"

APPENDIX E
22a
table insert

Later Childhood	Development of relationships to social collectivities, particularly peer groups and children's institutions	Development of multiple associations rather than complete immersion in one collectivity
Adolescence	Resultion of relationships to social collectivities so as to achieve both Objective-principle moral orientation and social identity cementing individual-system relationships of allegiance and commitment	Integration of individual into adult roles and experiences Relative congruence between goals ar values of peer groups and adult inst tutions; neither "cultural warfare" of peer group against adult social structures nor domination of peer groups by adult authority Provision of pathways to adult activ which are consonant with previous socialization experiences
Adulthood	Maintenance of creative tension between social identity and moral objective-principled orientation	Systems of social support for alter patterns of access to economic and s resources Feedback to parental childrearing th supports encouragement of identity and diversity (i.e. neither authorit nor permissive childrearing, but rat authoritative) Pluralism for adults to encourage pluralism for children

APPENDIX E

22b

table insert

the pervasiveness of the social disruption, since many were the victims of abandonment on the part of desperate, confused, and besieged adults. The moral behavior of these children and adolescents is described by one student of the period, thus: "Not only did the homeless children present a pitiful spectacle, become diseased and die, but they gradually became a public menace, roaming the streets in gangs and committing every crime and violent act" (Geiger, 1968, p. 74).

These were children unattached to the adult human community, physically as well as psychologically. They apparently developed -- over time -- a form of vicious peer orientation. The rehabilitative strategy and tactics developed to deal with the bezprizornive by the Soviet educator and psychologist Makarenko (1955) reflects one of the few consciously conceived efforts to deal with the task of primary socialization and large scale redirection of an anti-societal peer orientation. Makarenko perceived the necessity of establishing a psychological commitment to and dependence upon the social structure of the human community -- first through the children's collective, then through the larger community, and finally through a total integration of the individual into the overall social structure. Upon this foundation of social identification were to be based all the higher aspects of socialization -- particularly moral judgment and behavior. In the specific historical circumstances in which Makarenko worked, the net result was the development of a well-disciplined and highly

responsible group of children and adolescents. In the long run, Makaranko's strategy became a system of socialization and education currently applied throughout the U.S.S.R. to produce children and adolescents who are so highly socialized and integrated into the collective identity that their behavior and attitudes are overdetermined by social authority (Bronfenbrenner, 1970).

A second example, expanding on the theme of disruption and social identity, is to be found in Israel. One of the more important aspects of the Israeli experience has been the integration of Jews from diverse ethnic, racial, and geographic origins into the common culture of the new state of Israel. This process has achieved success, although there have been many difficulties and, in some cases, the process of integration has been a marginal one. The Jews of Morocco provide an example of a difficult integration experience. While resident in their indigenous culture and locale, the Moroccan Jews constituted a reasonably stable and responsible group. When they moved to Israel, either because of commitment to Zionist principles or as the result of political expulsion, severe disruption occurred in many cases. The process of translocation and the status difficulties which they experienced in Israel were accompanied by some forms of moral breakdown, such as juvenile delinquency (Willner, 1969). Increased levels of juvenile delinquency and community and personal disorganization appear to be common consequence of

social dislocation and disruption

A less extreme but nonetheless serious breakdown of the human ecology -- with attendant problems of social disorganization, alienation and impaired moral socialization -- may be observed in the growing estrangement of adults and children from each other in Western industrial societies. A review by Bronfenbrenner (1962) indicated a decrease in all spheres of interaction between parents and children. Similar conclusions are drawn in a series of cross-cultural studies (Devereux, Bronfenbrenner and Suci, 1962; Devereux, Bronfenbrenner and Rodgers, 1969; Bronfenbrenner, 1970). Evidence points to a pattern in which the age segregated peer group increasingly moves into the vacuum left by the retreating adults. A study by Condry and Siman (in press) revealed that at every age and grade level children today show greater dependency on peers than they did a decade ago. The same investigators have found, consistent with our own thesis, that susceptibility to peer group influence is higher among children from homes in which one or both parents are absent frequently. The absence of salient adults appears to lead to greater domination by peers and presumably greater orientation to the peer group as a source of moral direction -- and is associated with such anti-social behavior as lying, teasing other children, "playing hookey," and "doing something illegal." Bronfenbrenner (1973) points to this pattern of peer orientation as the origin of ever increasing rates of juvenile

delinquency.

We may also cite research cited by Bronfenbrenner (1973) dealing with the effects of architectural and community planning which isolates children from diversity both in terms of the age and background of social agents. In a comparison of the "old town" vs. the "new town" West German investigators have found that children in the new "model" communities felt cut off from life and hostile to adults, whereas children in the old cities had a more integrated social identity and were more positive about adults. Clearly the new towns, which are essentially "bedroom communities," may be expected to disturb the condition of social pluralism posited as necessary for enhanced moral socialization.

What appears to be operating here is a process by which social and personal identity form the foundation upon which moral behavior is built. But our account of the long term results of Makarenko's integrative program of socialization suggests that the relationship between identity and morality is not a simple one. If, as clearly seems to be the case, too little integration of the individual into the social collectivity undermines the psycho-social foundation upon which moral judgment and behavior are based, what about the opposite extreme? Is there a point at which total social integration becomes as morally destructive to the individual as social disarray?

Turning once again to history, we see Hitler's Germany

as a case in point. The aim of Nazification was to align institutional and personal life with service to the state. Every aspect of the public and private life of the people was to be integrated into a comprehensive ideological master plan. The result was an amalgamation of moral orientation into a single, overarching submission to authority. In this way the countervailing forces of Level 2 orientations and Level 3 morality were effectively neutralized. It should be noted that this example reflects the role of a pluralist setting above and beyond its impact on the individual's moral socialization. That is, a pluralist system must generate higher order moral systems to allow the diversities to coexist harmoniously -- assuming elements of the system do not seek to destroy the pluralist diversity. In the case of Nazi Germany, the deterioration of moral judgment throughout the society has become legendary, and leaves an image of a people caught in a totalitarian moral debacle (Shirer, 1959).

Consideration of those who retained their moral identity in the midstof terror and who continued to assert their ethical values through moral judgment and behavior will return us to the major thesis of this discussion. Over and over, the accounts of "resisters" to Nazism -- be they Jews in the concentration camps who refused to allow themselves to be dehumanized and morally denuded (Bettelheim, 1943) or clergymen who continued to judge and oppose (Bonhoeffer, 1953)

-- reveal some alternative or competing allegiance, some identity not under the sway of Nazi totalitarianism. Even in the case of the army leadership which attempted to assassinate Hitler we find a pattern of alternative allegiance for it appears such action was based on loyalty to the Officer Corps and its tradition, and a desire to preserve it from destruction (Shirer, 1959). Social pluralism safeguards mature and independent moral judgment and behavior by providing a pattern of countervailing social forces leading to the establishment of Level 3 moral development. Once again we are brought back to our central theme: morally mature and independent judgment and behavior are facilitated by a pluralistic, as opposed to a monolithic or anomic, socio-psychological human ecology.

V. An Empirical Illustration

Finally, we undertake a preliminary empirical test of our hypothesis with data available from a continuing program of cross-cultural research being conducted at Cornell University.

First, however, we may review our basic concepts. By pluralistic we mean a setting in which there are social agents and entities which represent somewhat different expectations, sanctions, and rewards for members of the society. These differences generate inter-group and

inter-individual conflict that is largely regulated by a set of "ground rules" and a common commitment to integrative principles and/or goals. A monolithic setting, on the other hand, is one in which all social agents and entities are organized around an identity of goals and principles. Conversely, an anomic setting is one in which there is almost no integration; social agents and entities are either absent or represent a multiplicity of divergent forces having no normative or institutional coherence.

In terms of our typology, the U.S.S.R. of the 1920's was an anomic setting, whereas Germany under the Nazis was a monolithic setting. Identification of such historical examples is relatively easy. Systematic analysis of the factors contributing to a pluralistic setting, on the other hand, is very difficult. On the political level, the task has engaged the efforts of political philosophers and social scientists, and has proven to be an extremely thorny problem (Garbarino, 1968).

Because of the systematic interdependence of the sociocultural structure and moral development, we would expect to find a strong relationship between indices of sociopolitical pluralism and a measure of moral pluralism, the extent to which there are competing allegiances to social agents of moral question. Moral pluralism is viewed as the condition out of which Level 3 arises. In other words, to the extent that, in a particular setting, moral pluralism

arises out of socio-political pluralism, we may expect persons in that setting to develop Level 3 moral judgment and behavior. Our preliminary test of this general hypothesis involves a comparison of an index of socio-political pluralism and the results of an independent series of investigations of the moral judgment of twelve-year old children in thirteen societies.

The technique for assessing moral judgment is the Moral Dilemma Test (Bronfenbrenner, 1970). Children are asked to respond to a series of 30 hypothetical conflict situations such as the following:

> The Lost Test: You and your friends accidentally find a sheet of paper which the teacher must have lost. On this sheet are the questions and answers for a quiz that you are going to have tomorrow. Some of the kids suggest that you do not say anything to the teacher about it, so that all of you can get better marks. What would you really do? Suppose your friends decide to go ahead. Would you go along with them or refuse?
>
> REFUSE TO GO ALONG WITH MY FRIENDS
>
> _____ _____ _____
> absolutely certain fairly certain I guess so
>
> GO ALONG WITH MY FRIENDS
>
> _____ _____ _____
> I guess so fairly certain absolutely certain

Other items in the Moral Dilemma Test deal with such situations as going to a movie recommended by friends but disapproved by parents, neglecting homework to join friends, standing guard while friends put a rubber snake in the teacher's desk, leaving a sick friend to go to a movie with

APPENDIX E

the gang, joining friends in pilfering fruit from an orchard with a "no trespassing" sign, wearing styles of clothing approved by peers but not by parents, running away after accidentally breaking a window while playing ball, etc. These items were developed through a series of interviews and pretests in which parents, teachers, and school children were asked to indicate the kinds of behaviors about which adults and children disagreed. The items chosen were those which, in a factor analysis had the highest loadings on a general factor of adult-approved vs. adult-disapproved behavior, and lowest loadings on factors specific to a particular situation. Each response was scored on a scale from -2.5 to +2.5, a negative value being assigned to the behavior urged by age-mates. Three equivalent forms of the instrument are administered and the mean of the three is used in this analysis. Thus on the Moral Dilemma Test a child can obtain a score ranging from -25 to +25 with 0 representing equal division between behavior urged by peers and adults (Bronfenbrenner, 1970).

Consequently, a high positive score indicates a high orientation toward conformity to adult social authority whereas a large negative score indicates a high level of conformity and orientation toward peers. A score close to zero indicates a kind of "moral pluralism" -- i.e. adult and peer authority in competition. (We would not expect

highly "peer oriented" scores, given that the children are all enrolled in schools, are pre-adolescent and take the test in the school setting.)

Our index of socio-political pluralism is taken from a cross-national analysis of socio-political indices conducted by Vincent (1971). Vincent performed a factor analysis of 91 variables using the universe of 129 nation states as observations. The result was some nineteen factors. The factor accounting for the largest proportion of the total variance -- 21.1% -- was labeled "Underdeveloped." The second orthogonal factor, and the one in which we are interested, accounted for 14.9% of the total variance and was labeled "Democracy." For the purposes of our analysis, however, we shall term this factor "pluralism," an interpretation which seems justified by an inspection of the variables which correlate highly with this factor. Table 2 lists these variables.

[Insert Table 2 here]

Our hypothesis relating pluralism to moral judgment may thus be tested by assessing the relationship between the score of a country on the Pluralism Factor and the scores of its children on the Moral Dilemma Experiment described above. A high positive score on the Pluralism Factor indicates a high level of socio-political pluralism; a high negative score indicates a low level of such pluralism.

APPENDIX E

TABLE 2: VARIABLES HIGHLY LOADED ON PLURALISM FACTOR
(after Vincent, 1971, p. 270)

1. Effective constitional limitations (.96)
2. Current electoral system competetive (.89)
3. Current regime is representative (.86)
4. Freedom of group opposition (.86)
5. Considerable horizontal power distribution (.85)
6. Effective current legislature (.85)
7. Weak executive (.83)
8. Police not politically significant (.80)
9. Free speech (.78)
10. Considerable interest group aggregation by legislature (.80)
11. Limited interest articulation by institutional groups (.71)
12. Non-elitist political leadership (.69)
13. Military neutral in political affairs (.67)
14. Non-communist (.61)
15. Infrequent interest articulation by anomic groups (.52)
16. Bicameral legislature (.43)
17. Votes with West in United Nations (.40)
18. Low political inculturation (.39)
19. Power vertically distributed (.35)

We would therefore predict that there will be a strong negative relation between the Pluralism score and the Moral Dilemma score; high political pluralism scores should be associated with low Moral Dilemma scores (indicative of a pluralistic rather than a monolithic moral orientation). Table 3 reports the sets of scores for the thirteen countries in the Cornell study.

[Insert Table 3 here]

For the thirteen countries the correlation between the Pluralism scores and the Moral Dilemma Scores is -.89. This indicates that the greater the socio-political pluralism the less "authority-oriented" the children, or conversely, the greater the moral pluralism.

While the empirical test described above supports our major thesis, it does leave a number of questions unanswered. First, what are the dynamics relating pluralism at the level of the socio-political ecology of institutions and the structural patterns to pluralism at the level of the socio-psychological ecology of the child and his family? Our expectation is that the processes and relationships hypothesized in Table 1 point to such an explanation. We might explore the impact of political change on child-rearing patterns in times of drastic alteration such as occurred in Germany under Nazification and again in the post-war period under de-Nazification. Such an investigation might shed some light on the impact of

TABLE 3: PLURALISM FACTOR SCORES AND MORAL DILEMMA SCORES

Country	Pluralism Factor Score (range -2.11 to +1.25, minus indicates non-pluralistic plus indicates pluralistic)	Moral Dilemma Score (average of three administrations)
United States	1.25	2.22
West Germany	1.18	2.83
Switzerland	1.13	-2.09
Netherlands	1.11	1.18
Sweden	1.08	.41
Japan	1.05	3.75
United Kingdom	.94	2.63
Israel	.83	1.50
Canada	.78	4.32
U.S.S.R.	-1.63	13.52
Czechoslovakia	-1.73	9.46
Hungary	-1.79	14.06
Poland	-1.83	6.14

political "climate" on teachers, parents, and other socializing agents. Further, it would suggest the importance of membership in formal organizations for the socialization of children and adult's moral judgment and behavior.

Second, what are the factors accounting for individual differences within a particular society both in terms of the degree to which a particular individual encounters a pluralistic socio-psychological ecology and the degree to which individuals are able to make use of such ecologies in enhancing moral development? We must be alert to factors which affect the individual's ability to profit from diversity. That this is the case is suggested by investigations of the ability to profit from situations involving choice (Condry, 1970), the socialization of locus of control (Rotter, 1963), and the ability to handle cognitive complexity and dissonance (Festinger, 1957).

Factors such as the size of educational institutions have been shown to have an important effect upon the number and diversity of an adolescent's non-academic activities (Barker and Gump, 1966). Involvement in activities has in turn been shown to relate to the student's sense of responsibility for the school and to his classmates, and to the kind of "satisfactions" he experiences as a function of participation (Barker and Gump, 1966). Analogous research is needed to assess the impact of participation in multiple

institutional and cultural settings upon the moral judgment and behavior of parents and children as well as on the child-rearing practices of parents, teachers, and other socializing agents.

Finally, although we can begin to analyse the effects of monolithic settings upon moral judgment and behavior, little can be said about anomic settings. We have indicated evidence which suggests that pockets of anomie exist in Western industrial societies as a function of the abdication of interactive and directive roles by adults but it is difficult to study such phenomenon at the level of the entire culture -- presumably because a social system cannot tolerate such a state for very long. We must turn to historical events which create an experiment of nature such as that which gave rise to the bezprizornive in order to examine the relation of anomic social settings to moral development. Once we have a firmer grasp of the conditions under which anomic and monolithic settings arise, we may better be able to specify operationally the conditions necessary to generate and sustain socio-cultural diversity and, consequently, moral pluralism.

REFERENCES

Almond, G., & Verba, S. The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963.

Aronfreed, J. The nature, variety and social learning of moral responses to transgression, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 223-241.

Barker, R., & Gump, P. Big school, small school. Stanford: Stanford Univer. Press, 1964.

Bateson, G., Jackson, D., Haley, J., & Weakland, J.. Toward a theory of schizophrenia, Behavioral Science, 1956, 1, 251-264.

***INSERT Battle and Rotter

Baumrind, D. Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 1-103.

Baumrind, D. & Black, A.E. Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. Child Development, 1967, 38, 291-327.

Baumrind, D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1967, 75, 43-88.

Benedict, R. Patterns of culture. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1934.

Bettelheim, B. Individual and mass behavior in extreme situations. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1943, 38, 417-452.

INSERT between Bateson, et.al. and Baumrind:

Battle, E. & Rotter, J. Children's feelings of personal control as related to social class and ethnic group. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 482-490.

APPENDIX E

Bocha, L. The development of independence: a comparative study. Child Development, 1957, 28, 85-92.

Bonhoeffer, D. Letters and papers from prison. New York: MacMillan Company, 1953.

Bowlby, J. Forty juvenile thieves, their character and home life. London: Hogarth Press, 1946.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Developmental research and public policy. In J. M. Romanshin (Ed.), Social science and social welfare. New York: Council of Social Work Education, 1973.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Reaction to social pressure from adults versus peers among Soviet day school and boarding school pupils in the perspective of an American sample. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 179-189.

Bronfenbrenner, U. The role of age, sex, class and culture in studies of moral development. Religious Education, 1962, 57, (4, Research Supplement), 545-561.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Some familial antecedents of responsibility and leadership in adolescents. In L. Petrullo B. L. Bass (Eds.), Leadership and interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961

APPENDIX E

Bronfenbrenner, U. Soviet methods of character education. American Psychologist, 1962, 17, 5550-564.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Two worlds of childhood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.

Caruso, I. La notion de responabilite et de justice immanente de l'enfant. Archives de Psychologie, 1943, 29, 113-170.

Condry, J. Freedom, choice and the development of individuation. mimeo. Cornell University, 1971.

Dennis, W. Animism and related tendencies in Hopi children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1943, 38, 21-36.

Devereux, E., Bronfenbrenner, U., & Suci, G. Patterns of parent behavior in American and West German: a cross-national comparison. International Social Science Journal, 1962, 14, 488-506.

Devereux, E., Bronfenbrenner, U. & Rodgers, R. Child rearing in England and the United States: a cross-national comparison. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1969, 31, 257-270.

Durkin, D. Children's concepts of justice: a comparison with the Piaget data. Child Development, 1959 (a), 30, 59-67.

Durkin, D. Children's acceptance of reciprocity as a justice principle. Child Development, 1959 (b), 30, 289-296.

APPENDIX E

Durkin, D. Children's concepts of justice: a further comparison with the Piaget data. Journal of Educational Research, 1959 (c), 52, 252-257.

Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957.

Ferguson, J. Moral values in the ancient world. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1958.

Freud, A. & Dann, S. An experiment in group upbringing. In The psychoanalytic study of the child. Vol. VI, 1951, 127-168.

****INSERT here

Goodman, M. The individual and culture. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1967.

Geiger, H. The family in soviet Russia. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Harrower, M. R. Social status and moral development. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1935, 75-95.

Havighurst, R. & Neugarten, B. American Indian and white children. Chicago: University of Chicagor Press, 1955.

Hunt, J. McV. Intrinsic motivation and its role in psychological development. Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1965, 189-282.

Kagan, J. Change and continuity in infancy. New York: John Wiley, 1971.

INSERT between Freud... and Goodman

Garbarino, J. Political and religious authority and the democratic political system. Unpublished thesis, St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York, 1968.

Kohlberg, L. The impact of cognitive maturity on the development of sex-role attitudes in the years four to eight. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1967, 75, 91-165.

Kohlberg, L. & Selman, R. Preparing school personnel relative to values: a look at moral education in the schools. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1972.

Kohlberg, L. Stage and sequence: the cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Lee, L. C. The development of moral judgment and cognition from childhood through adolescence: a test of Piagetian theory. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1971, 83, 93-146.

Lerner, E. The problem of perspective in moral reasoning. American Journal of Sociology, 1937 (a), 43, 248-269.

Lerner, E. Constraint areas and moral judgment of children. Menasha, Wisconsin: Banta, 1937 (b).

Liu, C. The influence of cultural background on the moral judgment of children. Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1950.

MacRae, D., Jr. A test of Piaget's theories of moral development. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 14-18.

Makarenko, A. S. The road to life. Moscow: Foreign Languages Press, 1955.

Medinnus, G. R. An investigation of Piaget's concept of moral judgment in six to twelve year old children from lower socio-economic groups. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1957.

Medinnus, G. R. Immanent justice in children: a review of literature and additional data. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1959, 94, 253-262.

Melden, A. I. Ethical Theories. Englewood Cliffs New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Morris, J. F. The development of moral values in children. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 28, 1-14.

Murdock, G. Social structure. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1949.

Myers, P. History as past ethics. New York: Ginn & Company, 1913.

Piaget, J. The moral judgment of the child. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1932.

Ponzo, E. An investigation into the development of judicial knowledge. Education and Psychology, 1956, 3, 1-20.

Robertson, J. H A short history of morals. London: Watts and Co., 1929.

Robertson, J. H. Morals in world history. London: Watts and Co., 1947.

Shirer, W. The rise and fall of the third reich. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950

INSERT Sidwick

Stayton, D., Hogan, R., & Ainsworth, M. Infant obedience and maternal behavior: origins of socialization reconsidered. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1057-1069.

Sullivan, E., McCullough, C. & Stager, M. A developmental study of the relationship of cognitive to moral development. Child Development, 1970, 41, 399-411.

Vincent, J. Scaling the universe of states on certain useful multivariate dimensions. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1971, 85, 261-283.

White, R. Ego and reality in psychoanalytic theory. Psychological Issues, 3, Monographs II, 1963.

Willner, D. Nation building and community in Israel. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

INSERT between Shirer and Stayton, et.al:

Sidgwick, H. Outlines of the history of ethics. Boston:
Beacon Press, 1960.